

SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME I

Central Council Tlingit & Haida
Elizabeth Peratrovich Hall

Juneau, Alaska
October 31, 2017
8:34 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Bangs, Chair
Michael Douville
Donald Hernandez
Albert Howard
Cathy Needham
Patricia Phillips
Steve Reifenstuhl
Robert Schroeder
Raymond Sensmeier
John Yeager

Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>2 (Juneau, Alaska - 10/31/2017)</p> <p>3 (On record)</p> <p>4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Please take your seats</p> <p>5 and we'll get started here. Welcome everyone.</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 I'd like to ask Orville Lind if he'll</p> <p>8 give an invocation for us, please.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 MR. LIND: Good morning, everyone.</p> <p>11 Stand, please.</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 (Invocation)</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Orville.</p> <p>16 With those kind words I'd like to call the meeting to</p> <p>17 order and I'd like to ask Mr. Kitka if he would make</p> <p>18 the roll call, please.</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.</p> <p>21 Steve Reifensstuhl.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Here.</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 MR. KITKA: Frank Wright, Jr.</p> <p>26</p> <p>27 (No response)</p> <p>28</p> <p>29 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.</p> <p>30</p> <p>31 MR. DOUVILLE: Here.</p> <p>32</p> <p>33 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka is here.</p> <p>34</p> <p>35 Robert Schroeder.</p> <p>36</p> <p>37 MR. SCHROEDER: Here.</p> <p>38</p> <p>39 MR. KITKA: Albert Howard.</p> <p>40</p> <p>41 (No response)</p> <p>42</p> <p>43 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.</p> <p>44</p> <p>45 MR. HERNANDEZ: Here.</p> <p>46</p> <p>47</p> <p>48</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 Southeast Alaska and the Tongass National Forest, is an</p> <p>2 amazing place. It nourishes us, it sustains rich and</p> <p>3 unique cultures since time immemorial and I think a</p> <p>4 very diverse group of Alaskans make this place their</p> <p>5 home and are very dependent on the rich resources of</p> <p>6 the Tongass.</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 It's also kind of unique because most</p> <p>9 of Southeast Alaska is in Federal land. If you</p> <p>10 combined Glacier Bay just a little bit to our west and</p> <p>11 north, this land area, over 500 miles in length, makes</p> <p>12 up about 94-95 percent of the land base. So there's a</p> <p>13 very deep connection of communities to the Tongass for</p> <p>14 not only sustenance and subsistence resources, but also</p> <p>15 for livelihoods for jobs and that's something that the</p> <p>16 Forest Service -- we try to work very hard with the</p> <p>17 communities to provide opportunities whether it's</p> <p>18 outfitting and guiding.</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 We do quite a bit of restoration work</p> <p>21 on the forest, engagement there, recreation, tourism,</p> <p>22 mining. There's so many different areas that we're</p> <p>23 engaged with and with communities to provide</p> <p>24 livelihoods.</p> <p>25</p> <p>26 I wanted to just say a few brief things</p> <p>27 about the Forest Service and some of our focus areas.</p> <p>28 Our mission in the Agency is very much focused around</p> <p>29 sustaining the health, diversity and productivity of</p> <p>30 the nation's forest and grasslands. The focus here is</p> <p>31 really on to meet present day use but as well as future</p> <p>32 use.</p> <p>33</p> <p>34 So the focus around sustainability is</p> <p>35 critical of our resources and we recognize that they're</p> <p>36 rich and that they are owned by the American public.</p> <p>37 We take that role very seriously. In the Alaska Region</p> <p>38 we've developed a strategic focus for the region to</p> <p>39 further identify and move forward this overall mission.</p> <p>40</p> <p>41 The region we're focusing around are</p> <p>42 organization and our effectiveness as an agency, a big</p> <p>43 focus around restoration work and that has broad and</p> <p>44 diverse programs I think that are recognized in there.</p> <p>45 We've been doing particularly on the Tongass a fair</p> <p>46 amount of restoration work, watershed restoration work</p> <p>47 to improve salmon habitat for example and that focus</p> <p>48 and those programs have engaged many. From the State</p> <p>49 to NGOs to some of you here on the Council who have</p> <p>50</p>
Page 3	Page 5
<p>1 MR. KITKA: Kenneth Jackson.</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 (No response)</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MR. KITKA: Raymond Sensmeier.</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 MR. SENSMEIER: Here.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 MR. YEAGER: Here.</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Here.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 MS. NEEDHAM: Here.</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, we've got a</p> <p>22 quorum.</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 MS. PHILLIPS: Here.</p> <p>25</p> <p>26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.</p> <p>27 We have a quorum, so I call the meeting to order. I'd</p> <p>28 like to ask Ms. Beth Pendleton if she would give us a</p> <p>29 few words. Then we will have Carla give an</p> <p>30 introduction. I'd like to have Beth first, please.</p> <p>31</p> <p>32 MS. PENDLETON: Good morning. It's</p> <p>33 good to see the Council here. I know there's probably</p> <p>34 a couple of members that are still trying to get to</p> <p>35 Juneau given some of the fog the last couple of days,</p> <p>36 but wanted to give you a warm welcome to Juneau. Also</p> <p>37 a welcome to the Tongass National Forest. Forest</p> <p>38 Supervisor Earl Stewart is here and will be here part</p> <p>39 of the week, so it's great to have Earl here as well.</p> <p>40</p> <p>41 I also want to recognize the amazing</p> <p>42 lady to my right, Fran Houston, and looking forward to</p> <p>43 hearing from you as well, Fran, and you're welcome here</p> <p>44 to Juneau. There's a number of folks that are</p> <p>45 attending this meeting as well from the community, from</p> <p>46 the tribes and the State and others and want to also</p> <p>47 give them a welcome.</p> <p>48</p> <p>49 We recognize that this part of Alaska,</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 been engaged in that work.</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 We also have a strong focus around</p> <p>4 sustainable recreation. In this part of Alaska we've</p> <p>5 seen tremendous growth and that has an impact on</p> <p>6 resources, but it also provides for livelihoods of many</p> <p>7 people in Southeast Alaska. We manage recreation</p> <p>8 facilities from the Mendenhall Glacier National</p> <p>9 Recreation area, which is the second most visited site</p> <p>10 in the state of Alaska, to a number of trails,</p> <p>11 trailheads, opportunities for mountain biking, hiking</p> <p>12 and many other recreational activities. There's also</p> <p>13 rich opportunities for individuals to be employed in</p> <p>14 that sector and operate through special uses on the</p> <p>15 Tongass National Forest.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 The last couple of areas that we've</p> <p>18 been focusing on are around infrastructure. That's</p> <p>19 kind of a dull word, but it's really, really important</p> <p>20 that we take care of the resources, the structural</p> <p>21 resources that we have, as many of these not only house</p> <p>22 our employees, but they're also really important in our</p> <p>23 communities and for recreational and other uses.</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 So that's a key focus.</p> <p>26</p> <p>27 It's been a challenging one,</p> <p>28 particularly in the last decade, as our funding in that</p> <p>29 area has been really tight. So we've been putting a</p> <p>30 great focus, the last area, is around partnerships.</p> <p>31 Most of the work that we are able to achieve on the</p> <p>32 National Forest, it's not the Forest Service doing it,</p> <p>33 but it's doing it in partnership with communities, with</p> <p>34 individuals, with businesses, with non-governmental</p> <p>35 organizations with the State and others to get that</p> <p>36 work accomplished. For that we are grateful and see</p> <p>37 tremendous mutual benefit in our work with others.</p> <p>38</p> <p>39 The Federal subsistence program is</p> <p>40 vitally important and I want to acknowledge the work of</p> <p>41 this board in particular for how you work together, for</p> <p>42 how you bring issues forward, the critical role that</p> <p>43 you play in developing the regulatory proposals,</p> <p>44 contributions to management plans, to the Fisheries</p> <p>45 Monitoring Plans, your input in rural and nonrural</p> <p>46 determinations and also the work you do around</p> <p>47 allocations of subsistence resources sometimes when</p> <p>48 restrictions may be needed.</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 I also want to recognize the staff that 2 work and support this board and support the program. 3 We have a number of employees, many who are in 4 attendance today, DeAnna Perry, who is your 5 coordinator, the Interagency Staff Committee, Tom 6 Whitford, who is the key representative there, as well 7 as members of the Tongass Work Force, who also help to 8 support this program and do a lot of the analysis. I'm 9 grateful for their efforts.</p> <p>10 11 And then I think the last thing that I 12 really wanted to talk a little bit about is the 13 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, which has been a 14 tremendous focus through the Federal Subsistence 15 Program and has really touched I think many of the 16 communities here in Southeast. I just wanted to share 17 I'm really proud of the work of the Council here and of 18 the Federal Subsistence Board. Most importantly I 19 think of the communities and the engagement with 20 communities.</p> <p>21 22 To date, on lands managed by the U.S. 23 Forest Service in Southeast and also on the Chugach 24 National Forest in Southcentral Alaska, there have been 25 over \$27 million that have been invested to complete 88 26 projects in the subsistence Fisheries Resource 27 Monitoring Program. Nearly \$15 million of that total 28 has been direct contracts with tribal governments to 29 perform that work.</p> <p>30 31 One of the things that we've really 32 been focusing on in the Forest Service in the last 33 couple of years is to ensure -- and we do a fair amount 34 of contract work. About a fifth of our budget, roughly 35 \$20 million-plus is done in contract work and our focus 36 has really been to ensure that those dollars are 37 staying in Southeast and Southcentral Alaska where 38 there are qualified businesses to do that work.</p> <p>39 40 It's been a real focus 8(a) contract, 41 women-owned businesses have been a particular focus. 42 We've been working with a number of the tribes. In 43 this program, the Fisheries Monitoring Program, has 44 been really instrumental in touching communities and 45 engaging the tribes in Southeast Alaska.</p> <p>46 47 The number of jobs that are provided 48 they're typically seasonal in nature. Many of them are 49 working with some of the sockeye salmon projects. Some 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 work that you do that come forward from this meeting. 2 3 Thank you for being here. 4 5 Welcome to Juneau. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms. 8 Pendleton. First I'd like to apologize for the mix-up 9 on my agenda for the introduction order. Carla 10 Casulucan, do you have an introduction for us? 11 12 MS. CASULUCAN: Good morning, everyone. 13 For those of you who don't know me my name is Carla 14 Casulucan. I am the tribal relations specialist for 15 the Tongass National Forest. My Tlingit name is Kat 16 Xoon. I come from Hoonah with family roots that 17 actually stretch far away to Sitka. I am Kaagwaantaan 18 in the Box House. Very honored to be here today to 19 come and observe and learn from you all. 20 21 In the meantime, I would actually like 22 to present this lovely lady to my left here. We are 23 certainly taking every advantage of encouraging all of 24 our events and all of our events and all of our 25 meetings and functions to utilize the clan elders in 26 whatever locale we happen to be in so that they can 27 welcome you traditionally to their homeland. 28 29 Without further ado, here is Ms. Fran 30 Houston. 31 32 MS. HOUSTON: Gunalcheesh, Carla, Beth. 33 My name is Fran Houston. I'm the Raven moiety, the Dog 34 Salmon Clan from the Yaxte Hit, Big Dipper House out at 35 Auke Bay. My Tlingit name is X'uncel. I would like to 36 say good morning to everyone. That's one of my 37 favorite sayings, so good morning. I see some familiar 38 faces from Sitka and Yakutat. 39 40 I would like to wish each and every one 41 of you on your three or four days' meeting the best of 42 luck on what you can come up with and hope everything 43 works out just fine for all of you. The people behind 44 me, I don't like to have my back to people, but I want 45 to say welcome to you too back behind me. 46 47 With the board, gunalcheesh. 48 49 Thank you for giving me this time to 50</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 I know you're well familiar with in Hyadaburg. Also in 2 Sitka. Those are some longer-term projects. But those 3 projects and others through the Monitoring Program 4 support anywhere from 30 to 60 jobs during the season 5 and that's significant and very important particularly 6 in some of the communities that have chronically high 7 unemployment rates.</p> <p>8 9 So it's a good program not only for the 10 resources but for the communities and helping to build 11 some of those technical skills and that deeper tie to 12 the land and the resources here in Southeast and 13 Southcentral Alaska.</p> <p>14 15 So there's a busy week ahead. You have 16 a very very full agenda. I'm looking forward to 17 participating as much as I can. I should be here a 18 good part of today and throughout the week as I can. I 19 strongly encourage those that are in the public to 20 participate strongly. This is a great opportunity for 21 visiting with the Board on your issues, on your 22 concerns. The Council Members gain information from 23 those that come forward and share and inform relative 24 to the different issues that they may have or to the 25 topics that the board is taking up this week.</p> <p>26 27 We are at, I think, a time of critical 28 environmental change and we're seeing that day in and 29 day out for those of us that live here in Southeast. 30 We see that in some of the changes in fish runs to -- 31 if you've been around Mendenhall Glacier for any number 32 of years, you certainly see the changes and the 33 diminishment of the glacier and the ice fields.</p> <p>34 35 So it's a time of change. I think it's 36 really critical that people served by ANILCA, this 37 program is a tremendous opportunity and I feel 38 privileged to be a part of it and my encouragement to 39 really encourage people to engage in the subsistence 40 process. To communicate your experiences and to make 41 sure that your voice is heard is extremely important.</p> <p>42 43 So a busy agenda over the next three 44 days. Looking forward to the discussion, to hearing 45 from each of you as you deliberate, and also to the 46 members of the public and the communities in Southeast 47 Alaska as they engage. As a member of the Federal 48 Subsistence Board, I look forward to hearing about the 49 issues discussed here and your recommendations and the 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 speak and enjoy your stay. 2 3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for taking 4 the time to come here. It's an honor. I think the next 5 person..... 6 7 MS. PERRY: Good morning, everyone. 8 For the record, this is DeAnna Perry, Council 9 Coordinator. I just wanted to give a few housekeeping 10 items as we all get settled in. I just wanted to point 11 out the exits. I know some of you folks came in the 12 doors to my left or also in the back in case we need to 13 evacuate the building, please use one of those exits. 14 The restrooms are just behind you just out those doors. 15 16 I also wanted to remind folks on the 17 phone to please mute your phones until you're ready to 18 speak and you can do that by doing *6. Our meetings 19 are taped by our court reporter and that really helps 20 us keep down the background noise. 21 22 I would also ask those folks that are 23 in the room if you could silence the ringers on your 24 cell phones. That would be very wonderful. 25 26 I also wanted to encourage everybody if 27 you haven't signed in yet to please sign in. Again, 28 the court reporter uses those to make sure that we 29 spell everyone's names correctly in the minutes. 30 31 Also, if you're interested in 32 testifying, there are some blue testifier forms at the 33 intake table. If you could take a moment to fill that 34 out and give that to one of the staff that are over 35 here at the table. They'll make sure we get those and 36 the Chair can call on you at the appropriate time. 37 38 A very huge welcome and thank you all 39 for coming. 40 41 Thank you, Mike. 42 43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, DeAnna. 44 45 Next I'd like to ask Mr. Earl Stewart 46 to come up and give us a little overview. 47 48 MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 49 Thank you, Members of the Southeast Subsistence RAC. I 50</p>

Page 10	Page 12
<p>1 really appreciate and I'm honored to be here today. I 2 only have today unfortunately, so I look forward to 3 working through any of the topics or issues that you 4 have at hand.</p> <p>5 6 As Forest Supervisor for the Tongass 7 National Forest, it's really my honor to attend. I 8 appreciate you taking time out of your schedules to 9 allow your venture to Juneau and I look forward to 10 working through the items with you.</p> <p>11 12 As I've said many times, subsistence in 13 Southeast Alaska is critical to life, history, heritage 14 and culture. It continues to be a point of interest to 15 me and specifically on the operational side. I might 16 be responsible for the management of the Tongass, but I 17 actually am duty bound to each of you all as members of 18 the public because the Tongass is, although a National 19 Forest, it is public land. My duty is simply to manage 20 that.</p> <p>21 22 It may be a very challenging system to 23 work on the Tongass, so from time to time there are 24 certainly critical elements that come before us that 25 might be difficult or challenging. I would say we 26 don't delay the opportunity to work through those 27 things because with every challenge comes multiple 28 opportunities in my mind.</p> <p>29 30 It is on my behalf that I work, but I 31 work on behalf of the public and your efforts 32 representing the public as Federal Advisory Committee 33 Members is critical to the success of Southeast Alaska 34 and to the Alaskans that are represented here. I would 35 say ultimately my duty is to you and to the other 36 members of the public.</p> <p>37 38 So very general opening comments and 39 thoughts, but I do appreciate the chance to be here 40 today and I look forward to working with you.</p> <p>41 42 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.</p> <p>43 44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. 45 Stewart. Is there any comments or questions for Mr. 46 Stewart.</p> <p>47 48 (No comments)</p> <p>49 50</p>	<p>1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. My name is 2 Mike Bangs. I'm from Petersburg. I've lived there for 3 30-some years now and I'm an avid sports and 4 subsistence user. I'm a commercial fisherman and I 5 have a small sawmill, so that keeps me busy.</p> <p>6 7 Thank you.</p> <p>8 9 MS. NEEDHAM: Good morning. I'm Cathy 10 Needham. I live here in Juneau. I run a small 11 environmental consulting firm that focuses and has a 12 vision to work with rural communities and Alaska Native 13 tribes on natural resource issues.</p> <p>14 15 On the Council I represent subsistence 16 users.</p> <p>17 18 MR. KITKA: Good morning. I'm Harvey 19 Kitka. I'm from Sitka, Alaska. I'm retired and an 20 avid subsistence gatherer as well as sportsman.</p> <p>21 22 MR. SCHROEDER: I'm Bob Schroeder. I'm 23 from Juneau, retired. Started working on the 24 subsistence issue professionally in about 1980. I 25 thought the work would be done in a couple years. That 26 didn't take place. I spent about 30 years doing 27 research and being involved in management of 28 subsistence issues in Southeast Alaska and around the 29 state. I'm a very dedicated hunter, fisherman and rely 30 on natural resources for food that I eat.</p> <p>31 32 MR. DOUVILLE: Good morning. I'm Mike 33 Douville. I'm from Craig. I'm a subsistence user, 34 hunter, trapper, sport fisherman. I'm a full-time 35 commercial fisherman also and I've served for many 36 years on the Craig City Council and also a Craig Tribal 37 Association council member also.</p> <p>38 39 MR. HERNANDEZ: My name is Don 40 Hernandez. I'm from Point Baker on Prince of Wales 41 Island where I do a lot of subsistence harvesting of 42 fish and wildlife. I'm also a commercial fisherman. I 43 have a salmon gillnet permit and a halibut IFQ.</p> <p>44 45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Now if I 46 could ask, starting over here with Mr. Stewart, to just 47 give a brief introduction and we'll go across and back 48 through the audience so we know who's here.</p> <p>49 50</p>
Page 11	Page 13
<p>1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I have one comment. 2 I've been on the RAC for quite a few years now, 13, 14 3 or so years. I lost track. But I notice that lately, 4 in the last few meetings we've had, there's less and 5 less support staff. I understand that there's problems 6 with funding, but it really makes it more difficult for 7 us to make good decisions if we don't have staff here 8 to help with that. So I'm hoping in the future that we 9 can have more support.</p> <p>10 11 Thank you.</p> <p>12 13 MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 Appreciate the recommendation and I will certainly see 15 what opportunities exist to allow for fuller 16 participation in the future.</p> <p>17 18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very much.</p> <p>19 20 Thanks for spending time to come see 21 us.</p> <p>22 23 MR. STEWART: My honor, sir. Thank 24 you.</p> <p>25 26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Now I'd like to 27 -- with introductions I'd like to start over here with 28 Mr. Yeager. If he could just introduce himself and let 29 us know what you do.</p> <p>30 31 MR. YEAGER: My name is John Yeager. 32 I'm from Wrangell and I'm a subsistence user. I'm also 33 a commercial fisherman and a sport fishing guide.</p> <p>34 35 MR. SENSMEIER: My name is Raymond 36 Sensmeier from Yakutat. I'm retired. I do have a 37 trawling boat and work it.</p> <p>38 39 Thank you.</p> <p>40 41 MR. REIFENSTUHL: My name is Steve 42 Reifentuhl. I'm from Sitka, subsistence user, hunter, 43 fisherman, and I'm also general manager of Northern 44 Southeast Regional Aquaculture. We produce salmon 45 enhancement programs for commercial and sport and 46 subsistence fisheries.</p> <p>47 48 Thank you.</p> <p>49 50</p>	<p>1 Thank you.</p> <p>2 3 (First three people away from 4 microphone)</p> <p>5 6 MR. BYERS: I'm Wayne Byers. I own a 7 landscaping business. I've lived in Southeast for 34 8 years. Have subsisted all over Southeast from Wrangell 9 to (indiscernible).</p> <p>10 11 MR. SCOTT: Good morning. Thanks for 12 hearing us in Juneau. So to the Council welcome back 13 and good morning, everyone. My name is Ryan Scott. 14 I'm the Regional Supervisor for the Division of 15 Wildlife Conservation.</p> <p>16 17 (Recording playing back)</p> <p>18 19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: That's not me.</p> <p>20 21 (Laughter)</p> <p>22 23 MR. GALLEGOS: Good morning. I'm Tony 24 Gallegos. I'm with Ketchikan Indian Community. I'm 25 the cultural resource director.</p> <p>26 27 MS. DUNDAS: Good morning. Irene 28 Dundas. I'm the tribal president for Ketchikan Indian 29 Community.</p> <p>30 31 MS. JAMES: Good morning. My name is 32 Carrie James and I'm the vice-president for Ketchikan 33 Indian Community. I also serve as the vice-chair for 34 the Southeast Alaska Indigenous Transboundary 35 Commission.</p> <p>36 37 MS. HAVEN: Good morning. My name is 38 Forest Haven with Metlakatla (indiscernible) student 39 doing research on subsistence (indiscernible).</p> <p>40 41 (Recording still playing back)</p> <p>42 43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Excuse me just one 44 minute. Whoever is online could you please mute your 45 phone and then we'll have introductions after we're 46 done here in the room. Hello? Is there anyone online?</p> <p>47 48 MS. PHILLIPS: Patty is, but my phone 49 is muted.</p> <p>50</p>

1 MS. CELLARIUS: Yeah, this is Barbara
2 Cellarius with Park Service. My phone is muted too.
3
4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We're getting
5 some voices coming across that there's somebody online
6 that's not muted their phone.
7
8 MS. CELLARIUS: It sounds to me like
9 there's some repetition of Beth's introduction.
10
11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It must have been
12 recorded?
13
14 REPORTER: I don't know what to do
15 about it.
16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. I think we're
18 okay. I'm sorry. Go ahead.
19
20 MS. TIBBLES: Good morning. My name is
21 Kristy Tibbles. I'm the Executive director for the
22 Board of Game.
23
24 MR. MUSSELEWHITE: I'm Jake Musslewhite.
25 I'm a subsistence fishery biologist for the Forest
26 Service here in Juneau.
27
28 MR. LIND: Uvllaaluataq. Good morning.
29 My name is Orville Lind. I'm with the Office of
30 Subsistence Management out of the regional office in
31 Anchorage.
32
33 MS. SILL: Good morning. I'm Lauren
34 Sill. I'm with the Division of Subsistence with
35 Department of Fish and Game here in Juneau.
36
37 MR. WAGNER, JR.: Good morning. I'm
38 Louie Wagner, Jr. with Metlakatla Indian Community. I
39 sit on the council.
40
41 MS. C. WAGNER: I am Cindy Wagner. I
42 live in Metlakatla with my husband. I love the
43 lifestyle.
44
45 MR. WAGNER: Good morning. Louie
46 Wagner. I'm a tribal representative of Metlakatla
47 Indian Community.
48
49 MS. S. WAGNER: Good morning. Shawn
50

1 (indiscernible). I'm an intern working at the
2 (indiscernible).
3
4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you. Is
5 there anyone else?
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We're going to
10 take a quick little break here, a 10-minute break, and
11 then we'll see if we can get this audio thing figured
12 out.
13
14 Thanks.
15
16 (Off record)
17
18 (On record)
19
20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. I think we
21 have the audio problem figured out and I'd like at this
22 time to ask if anyone is online speak up and introduce
23 themselves.
24
25 MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara
26 Cellarius with Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
27 Preserve. I'm the subsistence coordinator based in
28 Copper Center.
29
30 MR. REEVES: Jeff Reeves, subsistence
31 biologist Forest Service out of Craig.
32
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.
34
35 MR. KOLLER: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
36 This is Justin Koller, subsistence biologist for Sitka
37 and Hoonah Ranger District.
38
39 MR. COHEN: Josh Cohen, wildlife
40 biologist in Metlakatla Indian Community.
41
42 MS. HART: Good morning. This is
43 Debbie Hart. I'm the coordinator for the Southeast
44 Alaska Fish Habitat Partnership. I'm here today
45 representing the planning committee for the Klawock
46 Lake sockeye salmon stakeholder meeting taking place
47 later this month and I'd like to give a little update
48 when it's appropriate on the agenda.
49
50

1 Wagner. I'm the wife of Louie Wagner and I'm just here
2 to actually learn how the process works.
3
4 MR. ROSENDALE: Good morning. I'm Kyle
5 Rosendale, a biologist for Sitka Tribe of Alaska.
6
7 MR. SCUSSEL: Good morning, everybody.
8 My name is Chad Scussel. I'm the Regional Patrol
9 Commander for the Forest Service, so we do the law
10 enforcement throughout the Southeast, north and south.
11
12 MR. OWEN: Good morning. I'm Wayne
13 Owen. I'm the Alaska Region Forest Service Director
14 for wildlife, fisheries and subsistence programs. Good
15 morning.
16
17 MR. WHITFORD: Good morning. My name
18 is Tom Whitford. I'm the Regional Subsistence Program
19 Leader. I'm based out of Anchorage.
20
21 MR. SUMINSKI: Good morning, everyone.
22 I'm Terry Suminski. I'm the Subsistence Program Manager
23 for the Tongass National Forest and I live in Sitka.
24
25 MS. HARDIN: Good morning. My name is
26 Jennifer Hardin and I'm the Subsistence Policy
27 Coordinator from the Office of Subsistence Management.
28
29 MS. KENNER: My name is Pippa Kenner
30 and I'm an anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence
31 Management in Anchorage.
32
33 MS. CASULUCAN: Good morning once
34 again. My name is Carla Casulucan. I'm the tribal
35 relations specialist for the Tongass National Forest.
36
37 MS. HERNANDEZ BURKE: Yak'ei ts'ootaat.
38 Good morning. Melinda Hernandez Burke. I'm Tribal
39 Relations Program lead for the Regional Office here in
40 Juneau. My Tlingit name is Wexico Shaatk'. I'm
41 Tooka.adi (ph) and I thank you for being here today.
42
43 Gunalcheesh.
44
45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you all. We're
46 going to take a quick break and try to -- oh, is there
47 someone else back there?
48
49 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm
50

1 MR. MCKEE: Chris McKee, Wildlife
2 Division Supervisor, OSM in Anchorage.
3
4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anyone else
5 on the phone?
6
7 MR. BURCH: Mark Burch, the Department
8 of Fish and Game in Palmer.
9
10 MS. PHILLIPS: Patricia Phillips
11 calling from Pelican.
12
13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Welcome to all of you.
18 It's good to hear your voice, Patty. I hope you're
19 able to make it in today. Does it look like you'll
20 make the flight?
21
22 MS. PHILLIPS: It was looking good
23 earlier, but it's starting to fog in here, so let's
24 hope for the best.
25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Well, thanks
27 for joining in by phone and thank you to the rest of
28 you who are taking the time to listen in.
29
30 Now we're going to move on to review
31 and adopt the agenda as a guideline.
32
33 Does anybody have anything to add.
34
35 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair.
36
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Kitka.
38
39 MR. KITKA: I move to adopt the agenda
40 as a guide.
41
42 MR. YEAGER: Second.
43
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved by Mr.
45 Kitka and seconded by Mr. Yeager to adopt the agenda as
46 a guide.
47
48 Any discussion on the agenda.
49
50

Page 18	Page 20
<p>1 (No comments)</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Entertain a motion to</p> <p>4 call the question for adopting it.</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 MR. YEAGER: Question.</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question has been</p> <p>9 called. All those in favor of adopting the agenda as a</p> <p>10 guide say aye.</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 IN UNISON: Aye.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 (No opposing votes)</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Now we move on</p> <p>19 to review and approve the previous meeting minutes.</p> <p>20 I'll give you a minute here to look through them if you</p> <p>21 haven't.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 (Pause)</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Mr. Hernandez.</p> <p>26</p> <p>27 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. Can I</p> <p>28 move to adopt the minutes as written.</p> <p>29</p> <p>30 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Second.</p> <p>31</p> <p>32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved by Mr.</p> <p>33 Hernandez and seconded by Mr. Reifenhuth to adopt the</p> <p>34 minutes of the previous meeting. All those in favor.</p> <p>35</p> <p>36 IN UNISON: Aye.</p> <p>37</p> <p>38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed.</p> <p>39</p> <p>40 (No opposing votes)</p> <p>41</p> <p>42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Moving right</p> <p>43 along. I'd like to -- Ms. Pendleton, do you have some</p> <p>44 information regarding service awards?</p> <p>45</p> <p>46 MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr. Chair</p> <p>47 and the board.</p> <p>48</p> <p>49 It really is an honor to present some</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.</p> <p>2 Quickly from Wrangell. We're just winding down from a</p> <p>3 busy summer season. A lot of tourism and commercial</p> <p>4 fishing that took place specifically regarding</p> <p>5 subsistence. Our sockeye return to the Stikine River</p> <p>6 was good. There didn't seem to be any issues with</p> <p>7 people being able to get their sockeye on the river.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 However, I don't know -- I have not</p> <p>10 seen any of the information yet, but I don't know if</p> <p>11 the effort was as much as last year necessarily, but</p> <p>12 however the individuals that I spoke to didn't have any</p> <p>13 issue with getting their sockeye needs met there.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 King salmon. I hope that most</p> <p>16 communities, like Wrangell, are concerned with the king</p> <p>17 salmon return and the run size. There is not a lot of</p> <p>18 effort for king salmon for subsistence fisheries.</p> <p>19 Mainly sockeye is what is targeted, but with the</p> <p>20 closure of the king salmon fishery and some closures by</p> <p>21 sport fish and then also what the trawlers ended up not</p> <p>22 having as much opportunity, it seemed that king salmon</p> <p>23 was brought to the top of the list as far as concerns.</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 Hopefully this will bounce back and</p> <p>26 we'll be able to see some significant changes in our</p> <p>27 king salmon, but we're on a very conservative and</p> <p>28 somewhat worried about that return of that species in</p> <p>29 particular.</p> <p>30</p> <p>31 Continuing with the transboundary</p> <p>32 mining. Wrangell is very concerned about what's</p> <p>33 happening in B.C. and we just want to keep that on the</p> <p>34 radar through this board.</p> <p>35</p> <p>36 As you know, we finished up moose</p> <p>37 harvest. Our moose season was fairly good on the</p> <p>38 Stikine, however we're noticing that the moose are</p> <p>39 moving around, moving out to outlying islands and even</p> <p>40 Wrangell Island there seems to be more moose harvested.</p> <p>41 So it's moving the hunting pressure around a lot more.</p> <p>42 Where it was concentrated on the river we're seeing</p> <p>43 more people hunting on Wrangell Island itself and some</p> <p>44 of the other islands as well and being successful.</p> <p>45</p> <p>46 All in all, Wrangell is ready to close</p> <p>47 up and roll the streets up at 6:00 o'clock and call it</p> <p>48 a day.</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p>
Page 19	Page 21
<p>1 -- I'm going to call them length of service awards</p> <p>2 because each of you on the board give tremendous</p> <p>3 service to the communities, to subsistence users and</p> <p>4 you sit on a Federal board. I wanted to take this</p> <p>5 opportunity for recognizing two of your members for</p> <p>6 length of service.</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 The first of these individuals isn't</p> <p>9 here today, but it's important I think for the record</p> <p>10 that we honor and recognize Mr. Kenneth Jackson in</p> <p>11 recognition of his years of service to the Federal</p> <p>12 Subsistence Management Program as a member of the</p> <p>13 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council</p> <p>14 for the years 2012 to 2017. So if I have my math</p> <p>15 right, he's been serving for five years, which is</p> <p>16 significant.</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 So I would like to recognize Ken</p> <p>19 Jackson. We have this certificate for him and we'll</p> <p>20 present that or ask that you present that at the next</p> <p>21 opportunity or we'll make sure that that gets to him.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 The next individual to be recognized</p> <p>24 has a few more years of service and would like to honor</p> <p>25 Don Hernandez in recognition of his years of service to</p> <p>26 the Federal Subsistence Management Program as a member</p> <p>27 of the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory</p> <p>28 Council for the years 2002 to 2017.</p> <p>29</p> <p>30 So for 15 years of service to this</p> <p>31 board, Don, it's an honor to present this to you. I</p> <p>32 would like you to come forward and be recognized.</p> <p>33</p> <p>34 (Applause)</p> <p>35</p> <p>36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very much.</p> <p>37</p> <p>38 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. I'd just</p> <p>39 like to say when I got on 15 years ago I remember</p> <p>40 saying that I hoped to learn a lot while I was on the</p> <p>41 Council. After 15 years I'm still learning a lot.</p> <p>42</p> <p>43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Don and</p> <p>44 thank you, Ken. Okay.</p> <p>45</p> <p>46 Next I think we'll move along to</p> <p>47 Council Member reports. I think we'll start over here</p> <p>48 with Mr. Yeager.</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 It was a good summer overall.</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Thank you very much.</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MR. SENSMEIER: Thank you. I'm Ray</p> <p>6 Sensmeier from Yakutat. We had a good fishing season</p> <p>7 this year. Not just one or two or three, but pretty</p> <p>8 much overall. The king salmon count was low as in most</p> <p>9 districts. Fifteen sets were cut out, the</p> <p>10 setnet/gillnet fishery, under Situk angling. The</p> <p>11 sporties section of the Situk was also cut out for</p> <p>12 fishing for a month or so. Overall it was good. The</p> <p>13 biggest humpies that we've ever seen. Eleven, 12-pound</p> <p>14 humpies came in for a long time.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 I'll speak to the deer and moose when</p> <p>17 that comes up. I just returned from Wrangell-St. Elias</p> <p>18 Subsistence Resource Commission meeting in Glennallen</p> <p>19 where we took up the two issues that we're going to</p> <p>20 take up here as well. We have SEACC meetings in Sitka</p> <p>21 next week. Our tribe is still involved with the Tier</p> <p>22 III mining work group. Carrie James is the vice chair.</p> <p>23 She's in attendance here.</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 We recently received \$80,000 from</p> <p>26 Leonardo DiCaprio and hoping to get another \$100,000 a</p> <p>27 year for the next three years. I've testified, along</p> <p>28 with Victoria Demmert, the president of the Yakutat</p> <p>29 Tlingit Tribe, before the State Legislature and before</p> <p>30 the House Natural Resources Committee and DEC on this</p> <p>31 issue. We're trying to protect the Yakutat Forelands</p> <p>32 for our grandchildren and their grandchildren.</p> <p>33</p> <p>34 An agreement was signed in Anchorage</p> <p>35 during AFN with Bristol Bay Native Association.</p> <p>36 They're supporting the transboundary mining workgroup.</p> <p>37 We hope to get other tribes and IRAs and corporations</p> <p>38 to support that as well.</p> <p>39</p> <p>40 That's about all I have at this time.</p> <p>41</p> <p>42 Thank you.</p> <p>43</p> <p>44 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Good morning,</p> <p>45 everyone. Ray mentioned Situk those management actions</p> <p>46 fortunately allowed for the lower end of the</p> <p>47 escapement. Although it was hurtful to individuals, it</p> <p>48 was good for the stock. Not so in much of Southeast</p> <p>49 Alaska.</p> <p>50</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 The Board of Fish just -- well, I 2 should say the Department of Fish and Game has 3 introduced the idea to the Board of Fish to have three 4 stocks of concern throughout the Southeast this coming 5 year and that would be Unuk River, Chilkat and the King 6 Salmon and Seymour Canal in Admiralty. That's a very 7 small run, but the other ones are large river runs. It 8 looks like king salmon is going to have low 9 productivity for probably a full generation. We'll be 10 lucky on the second generation rebounds.</p> <p>11 The other stocks that haven't been 12 listed or some of them are also in trouble. The 13 supplies to hatchery stocks was the lowest return we've 14 had in 25 years at the Medveje and Hidden Falls 15 programs. That's an Andrew Creek stock on the Stikine 16 and they also had poor returns on the Stikine.</p> <p>17 Another fish that's doing a lot better 18 is herring. The fishermen I'm hearing from numerous 19 times is the small herring, probably two and three year 20 old, are just everywhere in the Sound and in the bays. 21 We've had them surrounding our net pens, both in Silver 22 Bay and Deep Inlet. But the whales are also abundant 23 and they're working on them hard. We'll have to see in 24 a couple years who's the winner of that one. But 25 definitely more whales around.</p> <p>26 Same thing for sea otters. They just 27 seem to keep increasing. More kelp plugging the 28 waterways. One thing that surprises me is that we're 29 seeing more abalone. I've got abalone right in front 30 of my house. We used to dive for it and then it seemed 31 like the sea otters totally cleaned it out, but the 32 last year and a half there's been more abalone around. 33 I don't take them anymore because they're so limited, 34 but there's other divers that are going after them. 35 Maybe something is changing in the environment that's 36 better for the abalone.</p> <p>37 NSRAA has introduced a new chum salmon 38 program over by Petersburg and Thomas Bay this year. 39 First year in there. Probably more importantly to 40 small communities that we took on the Gunnuk Creek 41 Hatchery, which went into survivorship and was 42 reclaimed by the State of Alaska due to bad debt and we 43 just purchased that in May and we're resurrecting the 44 program. Next year we'll release 200,000 chinook smolt 45 right out in front of the community of Kake and also</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 strong and the subsistence harvesters worked during 2 that portion of it and then had to shut down their 3 harvest mid season because the larger bulk of the stock 4 that we expected to come back in August never really 5 showed. So it's a concern.</p> <p>6 The reason why I wanted to thank 7 Ms. Pendleton for her comments is I think that that's 8 another added benefit of that program when it comes to 9 small rural communities in Southeast Alaska is that it 10 gives the communities an opportunity to have that 11 stakehold in looking at that resource, count the 12 numbers of fish that come in and then implement in- 13 season management actions that can help continue to 14 make decisions that are best for the overall stock as 15 well as meeting the subsistence needs of the 16 communities that are utilizing those systems.</p> <p>17 I think funding is -- Mr. Bangs talked 18 about funding being a concern, not having enough 19 funding to necessarily support our actions and I would 20 extend that on to being able to hope that we can find 21 ways. I've been on the Council nine years. It seems 22 like we're always talking about our funding being 23 reduced and being able to support that Fisheries 24 Resource Monitoring Program projects have been cut over 25 the years because that funding has been reduced.</p> <p>26 We also really need wildlife resource 27 monitoring, which we do not have. So thanks again, Ms. 28 Pendleton, for bringing that to the forefront, the 29 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and the 30 importance of it. It was good to hear the numbers of 31 the communities that benefit back from that and I hope 32 that we can find ways to be effective to help assure 33 that some of these funding concerns can be addressed 34 over the next year or so.</p> <p>35 With that, the last thing I wanted to 36 say, I've been interested and working on climate change 37 issues. Not projects necessarily, but attending 38 climate change forums and meetings. I made one 39 observation this year and I spent a lot of time on 40 Prince of Wales and I got most of my berries in the 41 first couple weeks of October.</p> <p>42 I tried to pick all summer long and 43 they were really small and it was a wet, dark season 44 and then for some reason in October all the leaves</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 some chum salmon.</p> <p>2 Let's see. Deer have been abundant. 3 Tremendous numbers of deer up in the Alpine in August 4 and September. We didn't have that harsh a winter down 5 low last winter, so I think that it contributed to 6 ongoing good abundance of deer.</p> <p>7 The Department also opened up a little 8 more on the goat hunting and I don't know what the take 9 is around Sitka right now, I bet Ryan knows, but 10 there's been good goat hunting. The weather wasn't 11 very cooperative, so it was difficult to get out and I 12 think that probably held the harvest down a little bit.</p> <p>13 There was decent sockeye return to 14 Redoubt. It was enough fish that they opened up for 15 subsistence and it was pretty decent harvest there.</p> <p>16 That's all I have.</p> <p>17 Thank you.</p> <p>18 MS. NEEDHAM: Good morning again. I 19 want to thank Ms. Pendleton for her opening remarks. 20 One of the things that I wanted to report on in my 21 Council report was with regards to the Fisheries 22 Resource Monitoring Program. I appreciate that you 23 highlighted that in your opening remarks this morning 24 to talk about the benefits of that program that it has 25 on communities.</p> <p>26 As many of you may know, I have had the 27 pleasure to work on numerous Fisheries Resource 28 Monitoring Program projects over the years and more 29 currently I work with Hydaburg Cooperative Association 30 on the Hetta and Eek Lake sockeye salmon escapement 31 projects.</p> <p>32 In Hetta this year we saw approximately 33 6,700 sockeye return in a season where the brood years 34 were from 19,000 and 20,000 sockeye returns. So the 35 expectation of the return this year was that we would 36 get a healthy return in Hetta and we did get a very 37 early return in Hetta, which is something that the 38 community has been working on in terms of deferring 39 their harvest in the beginning so that they could 40 increase the number of sockeye salmon that come back 41 early and that portion of the run seemed to be really</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 started falling off the trees and there were big 2 berries everywhere. I think those kinds of 3 observations and notes should be taken somewhere 4 because I think we're starting to see more than just 5 the effects of climate change on our resources.</p> <p>6 MR. KITKA: Good morning. I've got a 7 little more to add on the Sitka. We had some mild 8 winters and the deer population seemed to be pretty 9 good. It was really nice to see them break up the goat 10 to different areas and be able to close certain areas 11 that were getting hunted pretty hard. It allowed 12 people to get out and get goats and not close the whole 13 island all at once, which was pretty tough on some of 14 the people.</p> <p>15 We also have a little bear problem. 16 Probably not only in Sitka but a lot of communities in 17 Southeast. I'm not sure but the bear population has 18 increased to the point where they're a problem to a lot 19 of people. Had a few maulings in a few places in 20 Southeast mostly because there's more bear than usual 21 that we see.</p> <p>22 They're frequenting a lot of places we 23 are. Not only that but we've had some problems with 24 them just walking down and taking the pets and things 25 that are tied up in the yards. So we've got a bear 26 problem in Southeast.</p> <p>27 We also had some concerns about the 28 salmon in Southeast. I know that in talking with some 29 of our trawlers in Sitka and they talked about how the 30 king salmon were long but they were skinny. Reading 31 some of the reports out in northern California and 32 Oregon where they say the forage fish have collapsed in 33 that area and the salmon are starting to eat their own.</p> <p>34 So the hatchery stocks they're 35 releasing are being eaten by the older salmon, which 36 has happened pretty much even in Southeast because some 37 of our sport fishermen are talking about catching king 38 salmon. When they cut them open, their stomachs are 39 full of little king salmon. So there's definitely 40 something going on in the ocean that's not right. 41 That's one of our big concerns and we think the forage 42 fish is starting to be a problem out there. A lot of 43 things eating on them.</p>

1 Sockeye in Sitka, like Steve says, was
2 pretty good at Redoubt. One of the monitoring places
3 up in Klag Bay it dropped so low that I wouldn't go up
4 there this year to harvest any and a lot of people
5 didn't go that way because the population dropped to
6 about 4,000 fish where the system used to have 20,000
7 or better. That's quite a drop.

8 The fish did not come in this year and
9 that might be part of the weather program. The water
10 temperature didn't change. It was awful warm off the
11 coast of Southeast, especially in Sitka. Up above 60
12 in spots. It's kind of amazing. It almost felt like
13 Hawaii water it was so warm.

14 So we're going to start seeing a lot of
15 different things out there. I know the squid in Sitka
16 are starting to increase. We're seeing an awful lot
17 more of those.

18 Like everybody said, the berry picking
19 was pretty treacherous this year. It's been pretty
20 wet. Salmonberries took an awful long time to ripen.
21 When they did ripen, it was a very short window to
22 pick. Blueberries were a little different and it
23 seemed like we had a good blueberry year.

24 That's all I have.

25 Thank you.

26 MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Harvey. Bob
27 Schroeder from Juneau again. I was thinking as
28 listening I probably second a lot of the things that
29 other Council members have said. I was thinking of
30 just the way harvesting and use of resources is
31 changing in Juneau. Obviously we lost king salmon this
32 year. Coho salmon fishing was rather difficult. Shrimp
33 have been closed for quite a while. King crab opened
34 very briefly with very small harvest limit. Herring,
35 which is the reason why indigenous settlements at Auke
36 Bay were really prosperous and were kind of the center
37 of the Tlingit universe, is just a memory. Our halibut
38 success rate has gone way down.

39 Is there any pattern here? Well, yeah.
40 No boats were on the water in April and May in Juneau
41 because apart from sightseeing and going to look at sea
42 lions there wasn't much that could be harvested. So
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 are we at some kind of a tipping point for major change
2 in resource availability? I don't know. I certainly
3 hope not, but I think that should be a matter of our
4 attention.

5 I continue to be very involved in
6 examining and looking at and working on climate change
7 and I think the effects of climate change will
8 increasingly be matters that involve matters that come
9 before this Council as just the species that we rely on
10 have, at best, different patterns of behavior and have
11 to adjust their biological cycle. On the worst side of
12 things, things that we just sort of thought of as being
13 always there in Southeast Alaska just aren't available
14 anymore.

15 A couple of other issues, I think that
16 the Council really needs to push even more on
17 transboundary mining and to figure out ways that we can
18 be effective in that arena by letting our voice be
19 heard. As a Federal administrative recognized Council,
20 we have some authority there.

21 I think we also need to look at other
22 environmental things close up, particularly water
23 quality, which is related to transboundary mining, but
24 it also is related to cruise ship emissions. I mean do
25 you really like the idea of cruise ships parking or
26 1,000, 2,000 or 10,000 people parking in front of your
27 home and flushing. It's not a very attractive idea.

28 I really think seconding would -- Cathy
29 was saying about the success of the monitoring
30 programs. I was thinking of one other thing that came
31 through the monitoring program is getting a lot of
32 people who maybe otherwise wouldn't be involved in
33 management issues thinking, oh, I kind of understand
34 how that's operating. I think we need to do more to
35 bring in people through that program and younger people
36 into the management arena so they understand what's
37 going on.

38 I suggest that we explore the
39 possibility of having youth or community observers at
40 our meeting and to use a small amount of funding
41 through the Subsistence Program to allow that to
42 happen. I look around and we don't have very many
43 young people who pay a great deal of attention to these
44 management things.
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 Let's see. Maybe that is pretty much
2 what I have to say although, without getting into
3 details on our current political climate, I think that
4 this is clearly a time when the Council cannot act too
5 strongly on the areas of our concern.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville here.
8 There is some concerns about things that we will
9 further discuss here. King salmon is one of them. We
10 got to fish all of four days this summer and that was
11 closed because they wanted to -- they claim that 12
12 percent of the fish caught by the trawlers in the
13 second opening was local stocks.

14 It kind of worries us that -- one of
15 the concerns is how close are these monitored and is
16 this really good information. There will always be a
17 river of concerns, so these rules apply in such a
18 fashion that it doesn't look good unless the monitoring
19 of these systems is really accurate and we don't think
20 that they are.

21 The locals think there's an awful lot
22 of bears. The bear population has been increasing.
23 That's in our book. They think there's less bucks to
24 harvest and I have a tendency to agree with them. The
25 deer are not a conservation concern, but there's a
26 disproportionate number and we will discuss that
27 further.

28 They also believe that there's a
29 rapidly increasing population of wolves and I agree
30 with them totally. But those are the things that are
31 of most concern that I'm hearing from our Unit 2
32 people.

33 Thank you.

34 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Don
35 Hernandez from the north end of Prince of Wales and
36 surrounding waters there at Sumner Strait. My
37 observations kind of echo what most of the previous
38 Council said. We had some real lacking fish runs this
39 year. I guess our community's main concern is the why.
40 Why is this happening. Why are the cohos so small.
41 Why are the king salmon so small. That's kind of a
42 major concern.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 I'd like to add one more species to the
2 list. As a net fisherman, I've spent 30 years fishing
3 the waters of Sumner Strait with a net, and one thing I
4 noticed this year and everybody I'm acquainted with out
5 there noticed the same thing, we had a severe lacking
6 of steelhead. We do intercept steelhead in the nets
7 and this year they were very lacking. We saw very few,
8 so I don't know how that's going to play out. Maybe in
9 the future.

10 I did make a steelhead trip this
11 spring. Spent a week up a river camping and fishing
12 and it looked really good in the place where I was, but
13 I'm a little concerned about maybe some future runs for
14 steelhead.

15 Other than that we'll talk a lot about
16 deer. So far it's early in the season but the reports
17 are a little bit -- some concerns about how the season
18 may go, but we'll talk about that later.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. DOUVILLE: If I may, I'd like to
21 add one other thing. You know, I winter fish king
22 salmon and the last couple years they are the skinniest
23 little fish. They're not like winter kings, nice and
24 fat. However, in the summertime, when we're catching
25 our first opening we have a mix. Some of them are not
26 as healthy and some of them are just fine.

27 We don't think it's river conditions
28 that are causing this. It's ocean conditions. So
29 these fish are rearing in different parts of the ocean,
30 but certainly we've had some areas of the ocean that
31 are not productive. These fish traditionally probably
32 go rear there and they're not getting enough feed. So
33 something in the ocean is changing.

34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. I'd like
35 to go to the phone line now. Ms. Phillips, are you
36 still on there? Could you give us your report.

37 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
38 Bangs. I'm here.

39 So the Pelican area we had a summer
40 that went by fast. It started last spring when the
41 bears started coming out. There's a lot of bears and
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 there's a lot of sows with triplets and twins and
2 that's an indication of bears that are eating well.

3
4 2017 was a good salmon year, but we had
5 poor salmon years in 2016, 2015. We're still seeing
6 these bears with a lot of offspring, so I would say
7 they're probably eating -- besides what they normally
8 eat in terms of grubs and plants, they're probably
9 eating a lot of deer. We're still seeing good deer
10 levels.

11
12 One day in early June I saw 12 bears
13 and 8 of them on one beach and five of them -- six of
14 them -- well, two were sows, one sow with three cubs
15 and they were large cubs, and one sow with a small cub,
16 but seen other sows with cubs on other beaches. So I
17 saw 12 bears that day.

18
19 The berry season for us, there was a
20 lot of berries, but the birds got to them before they
21 could even ripen up and we could pick them. I did see
22 bear scat with some blueberries, but not the amount
23 that you usually see when they ripen up.

24
25 Our community is a trawl community
26 primarily. They had a good season this season, but
27 they rely on the winter kings to get through the rest
28 of the year. There's hardly any winter kings. I mean
29 it's to be expected this time of year, but to see where
30 it's even less than what they normally get it's going
31 to make it tough. It makes it more important to have
32 subsistence to rely on.

33
34 The summer seine season really impacted
35 our inlet. I recognize they all need to make money and
36 have a way of life. The areas open were way up to near
37 the mouth of Lisianski River and right up to the flats.
38 It's just like, come on, you've got to let some cohos
39 in there and we had quite a few of us locals contact
40 Fish and Game and going why are you moving the line so
41 far up. After some squawking they moved the line back,
42 but it already had two or three openings. It's almost
43 like they're cutting off their nose to spite
44 themselves. I mean, come on, you've got to let some of
45 that fish through.

46
47 District 13 of which Lisianski is part
48 of had the highest harvest levels and you can tell it
49 by the effort that went on, the amount of boats that
50

1 were in here, big boats too. Small boats also, but we
2 were hit hard. I wonder if the U.S. Forest Service has
3 fully identified the pink salmon streams or salmon
4 streams, anadromous streams in our district.

5
6 Because you see some of these boats
7 fishing close to where -- I'm thinking, hey, salmon
8 spawn in there, what are you doing so close, but I
9 don't know if it's identified and such. I think there
10 should be a better inventory of the salmon streams in
11 District 13.

12
13 It really impacts the amount of cohos
14 going up the stream. We're actually getting cohos
15 later in the year, like now, because there's nobody
16 fishing. No seiners, you know, scooping them up near
17 the stream source. Anyway, there's quite a bit of
18 concern about that.

19
20 I guess that's where I'll leave it at,
21 Chairman Bangs.

22
23 Thank you.

24
25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.
26 Thank you all.

27
28 Mike Bangs here reporting from the
29 Petersburg area. I think I could reiterate most
30 everyone else's except for a few things. We had really
31 good red huckleberries. We had a bumper crop and I
32 don't know why, but it was good. It was really good.
33 But for blue huckleberries and blueberries not so good.

34
35 King crab is a thing in our area, I
36 don't know about up here around Juneau, but we're
37 having a really big increase in red crab. I was
38 catching them on longline gear all summer long. It's
39 something we haven't seen in a while. In fact, they're
40 starting a commercial fishery tomorrow and it's not
41 going to be a very extensive fishery, but they're
42 showing enough abundance that they're allowing it. That
43 sport take or personal use as it is is going to
44 increase the bag limit substantially starting November
45 1st. So there's good signs for king crab.

46
47 King salmon, I probably shouldn't say
48 this, but the trawlers have been doing really good
49 since they reopened it around Petersburg. Don't tell
50

1 anyone, Patty, but surprisingly, after being so scarce
2 earlier in the year and having a closure, they're
3 catching a few. The sport fishermen and the trawlers
4 are doing fairly well close to town. I think that's a
5 good thing or a good sign anyway. Hopefully it holds
6 up.

7
8 Halibut was an off-the-charts year for
9 subsistence users and the commercial fleet. There's
10 really good abundance of halibut in 2C, which is our
11 whole area. So that's a good sign. I don't know
12 anybody that had trouble catching them on their 30
13 hooks subsistence fishing. It was pretty easy to catch
14 them. The trawlers were having trouble in the
15 summertime with trying to catch salmon and they'd have
16 to leave because they were catching halibut. So it's a
17 good sign for the halibut stocks anyway.

18
19 As Mr. Yeager said, moose hunting was
20 pretty successful. Our area, including Wrangell and
21 Petersburg, we harvested 117 moose in a month-long
22 season. I think the Wrangell people scared them out of
23 the river and they're all over by Petersburg.

24
25 (Laughter)

26
27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Bears, like Mr. Kitka
28 had mentioned, a couple others, that bears are becoming
29 a problem. We've got extremely a lot more sightings of
30 brown bear on Mitkof, which has been a rarity in the
31 past and now they're starting to see them on a regular
32 basis, which is kind of scary because there's a lot of
33 camping going on. Anyway, there's definitely a problem
34 with bears in our area.

35
36 We did have a bumper crop of rain this
37 year. Oh, my gosh. As Juneau did as well. So that
38 probably had a big effect on the berries and whatnot.
39 Anyway, that's all I have.

40
41 At this point I'd like to take a quick
42 break and then we'll go into public testimony.

43
44 A 10-minute break.

45
46 (Off record)

47
48 (On record)

49
50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Please take your
2 seats. We're going to begin our public testimony at
3 this point.

4
5 We have someone online, Deborah Hart.

6
7 Are you there?

8
9 MS. HART: Yes, I am. Thank you, Mr.
10 Chairman. My name is Debbie Hart. I'm the coordinator
11 for the Southeast Alaska Fish Habitat Partnership.
12 We're a regional stakeholder group who works
13 specifically on protection and restoration of fish
14 habitat across Southeast Alaska.

15
16 I'm here today to talk with you on
17 behalf of the planning committee for the Klawock Lake
18 sockeye salmon stakeholder meeting. This meeting is
19 going to be taking place November 14th and 15th in
20 Klawock. I'm here to extend an invite to Council
21 members and others, of course, that are participating
22 that might have an interest.

23
24 I want to thank DeAnna for helping to
25 provide some materials in your packet. I hope that you
26 all have a copy of the meeting invite, the official
27 email invite, and then also a draft agenda.

28
29 Just kind of real briefly, kind of an
30 overview of what the meeting is about, as I'm sure
31 you're really very intimately aware, sockeye salmon
32 across Prince of Wales and in the Klawock Lake
33 watershed are an important subsistence resource and
34 over the years have been in decline. There's been a
35 lot of information gathered over the years and recently
36 the Nature Conservancy completed a retrospective
37 analysis. It was finalized in May and has been shared
38 at a public meeting in Klawock at about that same time.

39
40 The goal of this gathering with the
41 various different stakeholders is to really help build
42 some up to date understanding of the status of sockeye
43 in the Klawock Lake watershed. Understand what maybe
44 has been happening to the resource and then how folks
45 can come together to look to make some improvements
46 both kind of within the fish habitat but also looking
47 at the population of the species as well.

48
49 It was good to hear some of the opening
50

1 comments and the different reports and understanding
2 folks' interest in changing climate, so I know there
3 will be a section at this meeting on basic salmon
4 ecology and trying to get a sense of how a changing
5 environment might be impacting not only Klawock Lake
6 sockeye, but other sockeye in the region.

7
8 I'm happy to take some general
9 questions. I don't want to take too much time, but I
10 just wanted to mainly extend the invite and welcome
11 people to participate at this meeting. Again, it's
12 November 14th and 15th in Klawock. It will be held at
13 the Klawock Tech Center. In addition to two days of
14 meetings we'll also have engagement with the community
15 on the evening of November 14th.

16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Debbie.
18 I've talked to several of the Council Members and I
19 think most of us would agree that it would be important
20 for us to have somebody there at that meeting. I was
21 wondering if somebody that's connected with Klawock,
22 maybe Mike Douville, would you be interested in going
23 to the meeting or Cathy or one or the other, both of
24 you maybe.

25
26 Mr. Douville.

27
28 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman. I'd be
29 happy if I'm there and I think I will be. I'd certainly
30 attend.

31
32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

33
34 Ms. Needham.

35
36 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
37 don't think it would be appropriate for me to present
38 the Council there because I'm on the steering committee
39 for the program and also on one of the workgroups. I'd
40 like to express the importance, I think, that having
41 this Council involved in that meeting can be really
42 beneficial down the line. I think one of the things
43 that this group is really going to work on is the
44 management of sockeye at Klawock Lake.

45
46 Some of the tracks are about habitat,
47 but there's also a management track at this thing to
48 work with community members on developing proposals to
49 help them meet their future subsistence needs and I
50

1 think that having someone from our Council there will
2 help bring that -- with the community over those two
3 days work on together and be able to bring that
4 perspective back to this table when we see some of
5 those regulatory proposals come down the line in the
6 future.

7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that,
9 Cathy. Anyone else on the Council that feels that
10 would be appropriate for them to be at the meeting or
11 we can hope that Mike can make it. If that's okay with
12 the Council, I think we would agree that it would be
13 good to have Mike there.

14
15 MR. DOUVILLE: There's no guarantee,
16 but I will make an effort to be there.

17
18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you for
19 that, Mike. Thank you again, Debbie, for your invite.

20
21 MS. HART: Thank you very much. I
22 appreciate Mike's willingness to attend.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Next we
27 have Cindy Wagner.

28
29 MS. C. WAGNER: Hello. I have a
30 letter. I participate every year in our Unuk River
31 subsistence moose hunt as a qualified hunter. This
32 year, September 18th this letter is dated, on the Unuk
33 River subsistence moose hunt 2017 there were five
34 qualified hunters; Louie, Cindy, Louie III Wagner,
35 Jimmy Lynch and Steve Huffine.

36
37 The subsistence hunt for moose on the
38 Unuk River is from September 5th to September 15th, 10
39 days. On September 13th, 2017, a rather large nonrural
40 hunting party arrived at the Moore property on the Unuk
41 River. On September 14th, two men in a John boat,
42 long-handled outboard, were scouting or running the
43 river above our cabin at 9:37 a.m.

44
45 At 10:50 a.m. on September 14th from
46 this Moore property on the Unuk River, three gunshots
47 from a large caliber rifle and then three gunshots from
48 a smaller caliber gun or rifle were heard from our
49 cabin two lots away.
50

1 Not only is this harassing our hunt, it
2 was uncomfortable with how close it was. We pay
3 Ketchikan property taxes on our land and cabin and
4 would consider this firing a weapon within the limits
5 of town.
6

7
8 At 11:25 a.m. on September 14th, two
9 skiffs were running the river scouting in the
10 subsistence opening. Two extra skiffs with the river
11 scouting, but not hunting, would raise the noise level
12 and therefore disturb the subsistence hunt or harass
13 the subsistence hunt.

14
15 I wrote this letter on September 18th.
16 I kind of made notes as things happened to and around
17 us. Who shows up, who leaves, who gets a moose. I was
18 uncomfortable staying at that cabin with gunshots and
19 it was two days before our hunt was over. I don't know
20 what to do except come and read this to you and give
21 you my concerns and my worries.

22
23 Last year this big hunting party, I
24 mean like 14 skiffs, were being towed up by this big
25 boat, but they waited until September 15th, which is
26 the last day of subsistence moose hunting. And we
27 decided to leave although we could hunt until the end
28 of the season because 14 boats with two or three
29 hunters each on that little Unuk River was pretty risky
30 as far as I was concerned. Just, you know, accidents
31 happen.

32
33 Thank you for listening. If anyone has
34 any questions, I'll try to answer them.

35
36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there any questions
37 for Ms. Wagner.

38
39 MS. C. WAGNER: It's just a letter of
40 comment.

41
42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Hernandez.

43
44 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank you
45 for bringing that to our attention. I was just kind of
46 curious. I think it was the first year that I was on
47 the Council 15 years ago that we established that hunt.
48 It was one of the first things I remember doing. I was
49 just kind of curious. In that period of time -- also
50 that was kind of a new thing to establish an early

1 season like that.

2
3 Over time, do you think that's been a
4 successful subsistence hunt over time in general?
5

6
7 MS. C. WAGNER: I think it has been.
8 It certainly helped with -- one of the reasons we asked
9 for a subsistence hunt was the airplanes that fly over
10 and land and bring parties in and bring supplies. We
11 don't have that during this little 10-day hunt, which
12 is pretty nice. No extra hunters that are running the
13 river because 14 skiffs is a lot of traffic on that
14 little river. But we've appreciate it. We've used it
15 every year. We've gone up early and stayed as long as
16 we could and actually got a couple moose.

17
18 So, yeah, it's been beneficial.

19
20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Is there a
21 comment on the phone line.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you, Ms.
26 Wagner. I have one little question. Was the law
27 enforcement contacted or notified about that problem
28 that you had?

29
30 MS. C. WAGNER: No, there was no law
31 enforcement on the river at that time that I was aware
32 of. It was just us five people, two cabins, our cabin
33 and our neighbors cabin, Huffines. And there's no cell
34 service. I think our neighbor has a satellite phone.
35 But, no, they were not notified.

36
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you. And
38 thank you for bringing it to our attention. Appreciate
39 your time.

40
41 MS. C. WAGNER: Thanks for allowing
42 this.

43
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Next we have Louie
45 Wagner, Jr.

46
47 MR. WAGNER, JR.: Thank you, Chair,
48 Council. My name is Louie Wagner, Jr. Born in
49 Ketchikan. Lived all my 69 years in Metlakatla and a
50 member of the Metlakatla Indian Community. Thank you

1 for allowing me to speak.

2 I wanted to speak today -- after the
3
4 Craig meeting last March we went up to the Unuk River
5 to check on the eulachons again and the river was full
6 of eulachons. They were running in all the streams
7 coming out. The Klahini, which is on the right facing
8 the river, they only spawn up in that one between six
9 and ten years. They don't always spawn in the Klahini
10 and it had a lot of fish in it again. Then the main
11 river had a lot of eulachon up past our cabin. There's
12 a lot of eulachon up past the Eulachon Slough.

13 I feel it's past time for us to be
14 trusted here on reporting what we find. We go up on
15 our own. I've been taking my son to the river since he
16 was four years old, so between the two of us we have
17 like 100 years of experience on this river. It's our
18 life. We depend on those eulachons.

19 The people in the general area, like I
20 reported in March, all the communities, they've always
21 relied on our family to catch the eulachon and bring
22 them in. This has not happened now for -- this would
23 be the 13th year that we've missed. We know at least
24 for the last nine years the fish have been running, but
25 we're getting conflicting reports that there isn't fish
26 in there and that is not true.

27 I don't know why we should be denied
28 for so long here and it's our way of life. It's what
29 we've always done and we will continue to do this. I
30 do appreciate the Council's number eight here on the
31 work that you folks did, looking at what could be done
32 about this here and that's the first encouraging piece
33 of work that I've seen and read here.

34 If we could start moving forward with
35 something like this here, it would really be good. The
36 people deserve it. They're being denied their fish
37 because -- I don't know. The truth is not being told
38 here. I feel we tell the truth. We've taken pictures.
39 I don't know what more we should do. I mean this is a
40 very important resources to the people. District 1 is
41 the only area closed in the State of Alaska. The rest
42 is all open.

43 We went up -- must be six years ago now
44 we went up into Carroll Inlet to check on eulachons and
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 the river was full. We made one set and we filled our
2 18-foot skiff. We brought it home, we gave some away
3 and we made eulachon grease. Now we're down to about
4 our last jar. We need to be able to make eulachon
5 grease again, but the fish move. Just like in the
6 Klahini they don't always spawn in there, so they do
7 move around. Now with these mines opening up we're
8 going to wait for them to kill everything off again and
9 we won't have our eulachon.

10 I don't know if any of you know Wally
11 Kubley. He's passed away now. He's from Ketchikan and
12 he was a business owner in Ketchikan. I think it was
13 around 2012 he sent me a clip, a cutout from the Alaska
14 Magazine where this guy did a study on the eulachons
15 and he spoke about how they move around in the
16 Southeast area on their spawning. We have so many
17 different streams down there. Like Bakewell Arm, they
18 go up into there and Chickamin. In the past sometimes
19 we had a -- we'd start at the Unuk and then we'd work
20 down the eastern beam canal there. In March the
21 weather is not nice up there.

22 Like I say, I started with my brothers.
23 We have a log that we have on the rock bluff up there
24 in the river where we bring our boat, we tie to that
25 log, you've got to know your way in there at high tide
26 so we can secure the boat there and it's safe. We're
27 not up the river and the boat is dragging anchor
28 blowing out to sea. There's no natural harbor there at
29 the Unuk. It's wide open to the weather. Though it's
30 really nice that we can safely moor our boat, but we
31 have to go in on the big tides and come out on the big
32 tides. If you miss, then you've got to wait.

33 That's all the things that I learned
34 from my brother and passed it on to my son and other
35 family members that we bring. We use that for moose
36 hunting too and we can stay at the cabin. Otherwise
37 you're pretty worried about the boat laying out in the
38 mouth of the river. My brother had to chase his clean
39 to Burroughs Bay once and just enough gas. It had drug
40 anchor and went out. The tides weren't big enough for
41 him to get in the river. He had a moose hanging in the
42 rigging and it had come loose and it was swinging, the
43 boat was rolling and he was able to get aboard and get
44 back up into the head of the river there.

45 Hopefully something will be done here
46
47
48
49
50

1 because we will go up again and we'll check the river
2 for lack of monitoring on the river and just to --
3 can't act on hearsay, you know. I'm here facing all of
4 you again and to tell you that there's fish in there,
5 plenty. There's not as many seagulls or seals as there
6 used to be.

7 I don't think there's like, the talk's
8 been going on, enough feed out in the ocean for these
9 things, but it is building again. Even the seagulls,
10 there's not as many seagulls, so it's better for the
11 escapement anyway. And the sea lions are always there.
12 Boy, they know. When the eulachon are there, those sea
13 lions are there.

14 I think that's about all. I just hope
15 something can happen this year. It looks like you
16 folks are getting started here on working on a plan and
17 to start listening to us people that come because this
18 is our life. It's how we live and born and raised. I
19 was fortunate.

20 Give you just a little story on being
21 with the old folks. They had a fish camp across the
22 bay on Hemlock Island and they had their cabins and
23 everyone had a smokehouse behind it. I remember part
24 of who was in like the first cabins along there. It was
25 always the old folks because the younger people were
26 out fishing for the summer. They would smoke dog
27 salmon and they would smoke it really hard. They would
28 get these coffee cans, the five-gallon ones from the
29 cannery and they would save them, put newspaper in the
30 bottom and then put the hard-smoked dog salmon in the
31 cans and it would last all winter because they didn't
32 have freezers. In the '50s very few had a refrigerator
33 when I was growing up. I was friends with all my
34 friends and their folks, grandparents were like my
35 grandparents. It's something that we need to try to
36 continue some of this here. I tell this story. I even
37 told it at the school and had all the teachers out
38 behind me listening to my story and it was just a
39 couple of the classrooms, you know, and they were
40 pretty excited about it. This kind of teaching is
41 important. Cultural camp in Sitka is really important.
42 It would be nice to see something like that get started
43 in Metlakatla so young people can learn how life was.
44 It wasn't all TVs and cell phones. You had to go get
45 firewood and help the old folks. At minus tides there
46 would be a lot of crab in the bay there and just
47
48
49
50

1 straighten out a halibut hook and tie it to a cedar
2 pole and go around with your rowboat and put them in
3 the bottom. The old folks would have a pair of
4 50-gallon drums with water, getting it heated up and
5 ready. We'd bring it in and they would cook the crab
6 and we'd have a nice feed.

7 I just wanted to share that with you.

8 That's all I have.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Wagner.
11 Are there any questions.

12 Mr. Douville.

13 MR. DOUVILLE: I'm disappointed that an
14 opportunity is missed. I guess what would you
15 recommend for monitoring so that you could better not
16 miss these opportunities again when there is fish
17 there. In your opinion, what needs to be done to
18 better keep track of it so an opportunity, if it's
19 there, is not missed?

20 MR. WAGNER, JR.: Well, when we go up
21 it would help, you know, if we could afford a cell
22 phone one of these days and we could call in and maybe
23 the biologist from the Forest Service could fly in and
24 see and then you won't just be taking our word for it.
25 I think that would be cost effective for the Forest
26 Service and we're going anyway. We're going to check.
27 We have to do that. That's the one way I think it
28 could be handled.

29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any other
30 -- a follow-up, Mr. Douville.

31 MR. DOUVILLE: I think in the past
32 years this has just been closed ahead of time and
33 there's no consideration for if they do show up. I
34 think that that's kind of a -- that's not the right
35 thing because they are missing an opportunity and I'm
36 not sure how it's being monitored, but perhaps the
37 district ranger should have the discussion to open this
38 if they're seeing enough eulachon in there. That sort
39 of makes sense to me. Not just say it's closed and
40 there's no consideration after that. It should be a
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

Page 42	Page 44
<p>1 judgment call if the fish do show up.</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 Mr. Schroeder and then Harvey.</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 MR. SCHROEDER: I'd just second Mike's</p> <p>8 comments. We've had this discussion other times at</p> <p>9 Council meetings. I really don't think the Federal</p> <p>10 Subsistence Program and Forest Service can take as an</p> <p>11 excuse for providing subsistence opportunity that it's</p> <p>12 kind of difficult to get to or it costs a lot of money</p> <p>13 to do. I don't think that that's a clause in ANILCA</p> <p>14 that says that well you need to provide subsistence</p> <p>15 unless it's kind of hard to manage. So I really hope</p> <p>16 the Forest Service as the land manager in this area</p> <p>17 would consider that.</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Kitka.</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.</p> <p>22 Louie, some years ago when you came before us and asked</p> <p>23 for something to be done because the eulachon had</p> <p>24 dropped to a very low number, how many years did it</p> <p>25 stay low and when did it start increasing?</p> <p>26</p> <p>27 MR. WAGNER, JR.: It started around</p> <p>28 2000 and that's when the Bruce Jack Mine had started up</p> <p>29 in 2000 and they were filling the pond with their</p> <p>30 tailings and they were overflowing right into the Unuk</p> <p>31 River. It was the same for the salmon. The salmon</p> <p>32 have declined and the bears have declined on the river.</p> <p>33 We used to see them all along the river. Smell what</p> <p>34 they left of the salmon on the banks. It's clean now.</p> <p>35 There's nothing on the banks.</p> <p>36</p> <p>37 Then it closed around 2010, the Bruce</p> <p>38 Jack Mine, and then we started seeing the increase in</p> <p>39 the salmon again also picking up. This year there was</p> <p>40 some big fish going by the cabin, which I hadn't seen</p> <p>41 before in the evening. They were splashing, going on</p> <p>42 up. There was what we could see was a fair amount of</p> <p>43 coho. For like five, six years we did not see any king</p> <p>44 salmon and two years ago we seen them in the river</p> <p>45 again. It doesn't mean they weren't there, but we</p> <p>46 started seeing them again.</p> <p>47</p> <p>48 So it was really nice to see the king</p> <p>49 salmon coming back into the river especially right in</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 Patty Phillips. I'd like to comment at some point in</p> <p>2 time.</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 Thank you.</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.</p> <p>7 You'll be next.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman and Members</p> <p>10 of the Council. I wanted to offer to Mr. Wagner the</p> <p>11 Forest Service does have a monitoring effort going on</p> <p>12 associated with the Unuk in that area. We'd certainly</p> <p>13 welcome the opportunity to try to figure out how to</p> <p>14 operationalize the specific needs or interests that are</p> <p>15 expressed by subsistence users.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 I don't unfortunately have the</p> <p>18 specificity to give you any details on it, but I do</p> <p>19 know that working with a local member in Ketchikan, the</p> <p>20 subsistence biologist, there have been flights to try</p> <p>21 to assess those numbers and everything like that. So</p> <p>22 we probably actually have some biological information</p> <p>23 to support Mr. Wagner's statements to see how we would</p> <p>24 proceed forward and I would offer from the</p> <p>25 Ketchikan-Misty Fiords Ranger District they would</p> <p>26 welcome the opportunity to work with the Council to</p> <p>27 meet the needs of users in Southeast.</p> <p>28</p> <p>29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.</p> <p>30 Stewart.</p> <p>31</p> <p>32 Ms. Needham.</p> <p>33</p> <p>34 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.</p> <p>35 Mr. Stewart, is that monitoring that is happening is</p> <p>36 that part of the current FRMP cycle project do you know</p> <p>37 or maybe someone like Terry could.....</p> <p>38</p> <p>39 MR. STEWART: I might have to yield to</p> <p>40 one of my colleagues.</p> <p>41</p> <p>42 MS. NEEDHAM: All right. He might be</p> <p>43 able to provide us some information too about the</p> <p>44 numbers.</p> <p>45</p> <p>46 MR. SUMINSKI: Good afternoon, Council.</p> <p>47 Mr. Chairman. My name is Terry Suminski with the</p> <p>48 Forest Service. Ms. Needham. Yes, we do have a</p> <p>49 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program on the Unuk for</p> <p>50</p>
Page 43	Page 45
<p>1 Kingsbury there. Back in 1960 when I was up there with</p> <p>2 my brother, got out of school and went moose hunting,</p> <p>3 boy that kind salmon, I'm not kidding, they were huge</p> <p>4 laying in the river. The ones we seen two, three years</p> <p>5 ago they were probably 20, 25-pounders. They weren't</p> <p>6 those big 50-plus-pounders.</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 I lost sight of finishing your question</p> <p>9 now on the decline. We did bring in enough fish for --</p> <p>10 we stopped in Ketchikan and then into Metlakatla. I</p> <p>11 think it was around 2002 and then we went back up the</p> <p>12 following year. There was fish up there, but not a</p> <p>13 whole lot. We didn't bother them. That was in that</p> <p>14 time period of when they weren't there.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 Later we found them in Carroll Inlet.</p> <p>17 It was so full in there it was amazing. Like I say,</p> <p>18 one set and just used part of the net and filled that</p> <p>19 18-foot skiff. The Forest Service enforcement was up</p> <p>20 there and talked to us. State Fish and Game came</p> <p>21 flying up on their fast boat and they talked to us.</p> <p>22 They didn't really look around to see all that fish</p> <p>23 there.</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 Those fish move around. Last April I</p> <p>26 was out trawling getting king salmon for take home.</p> <p>27 When I cleaned the king salmon, it had a eulachon in</p> <p>28 it. That's the first time I've seen that. I know when</p> <p>29 -- oh, what's his name. He passed away. On the Megan,</p> <p>30 he was over at Cholmondeley about six, seven years ago.</p> <p>31 He was catching king salmon trawling and he had</p> <p>32 eulachon in the stomachs, so they're out there and</p> <p>33 around. We just don't see them until we find them in</p> <p>34 the king salmon.</p> <p>35</p> <p>36 At least the last nine years the</p> <p>37 eulachon have been running in the river there. I lost</p> <p>38 a few years with my cancer and treatment there, so we</p> <p>39 didn't make it up the river, but we've been back up</p> <p>40 there again now and things are looking normal, looking</p> <p>41 good.</p> <p>42</p> <p>43 Thank you.</p> <p>44</p> <p>45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Wagner.</p> <p>46 I'd like to ask Mr. Stewart to come up and give his</p> <p>47 perspective from the Forest Service.</p> <p>48</p> <p>49 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Bangs. This is</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 eulachon. The general idea is they've placed cameras,</p> <p>2 remote cameras that they can monitor at the office and</p> <p>3 if they see signs of eulachon, generally predators on</p> <p>4 the river, they'll fly out and try to get a better</p> <p>5 estimate of the population.</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 I under Mr. Schroeder's comments. It</p> <p>8 is a difficult place to work, but we are trying. I got</p> <p>9 a note from Jeff just to get an update because I</p> <p>10 thought this might come up. In 2017 they were</p> <p>11 prevented from installing the cameras because of</p> <p>12 weather. They made multiple attempts in February and</p> <p>13 March. They got the camera in -- they have one for</p> <p>14 Carroll Inlet that was put in, but it was delayed by</p> <p>15 weather. The Carroll Inlet captured no activity.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 For the Unuk, there were aerial surveys</p> <p>18 completed on March 21st, 30th, April 7th and April</p> <p>19 25th. During the first and last surveys there was no</p> <p>20 marine mammal or bird activity noted. During the March</p> <p>21 30 survey eulachon were found to be present in the</p> <p>22 upper landing slough in the Eulachon River. Numerous</p> <p>23 seals and some sea lions at the mouth of the Unuk.</p> <p>24 Seagull and eagle activity was also present, but at a</p> <p>25 low level.</p> <p>26</p> <p>27 He also flew the Klahini, the</p> <p>28 Chickamin, Wilson and Blossom Rivers and Carroll Inlet</p> <p>29 and they saw no activity in any of these other systems.</p> <p>30</p> <p>31 He said visibility during the April 7th</p> <p>32 survey was excellent. The water was clear. The water</p> <p>33 levels were up. One very small school of fish was seen</p> <p>34 in the upper landing slough just a short distance</p> <p>35 upstream from the confluence with the Eulachon River.</p> <p>36 They also flew the Chickamin and Carroll Inlet with no</p> <p>37 activity documented. They were not able to conduct any</p> <p>38 ground surveys on the Unuk, but they did conduct two</p> <p>39 ground surveys at Carroll Creek. Well, they installed</p> <p>40 the cameras.</p> <p>41</p> <p>42 He said based on the comparison of the</p> <p>43 years' observations during the aerial surveys I believe</p> <p>44 a moderate return occurred, so I think that supports</p> <p>45 what Mr. Wagner was saying.</p> <p>46</p> <p>47 I think that's it.</p> <p>48</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p>

Page 46	Page 48
<p>1 Were there other questions? Just for 2 background information it has been closed since 2006. 3 I hope that helps.</p> <p>4 Thank you.</p> <p>5 6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. 7 Suminski. I'm going to give Mr. Yeager a chance to ask 8 a question of Terry and then we'll give Ms. Phillips a 9 chance to direct her question.</p> <p>10 11 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 12 Sorry, Patty. While I think the effort is being made 13 by the Forest Service on the Unuk, I'm interested to 14 know if they're taking in any consideration of the 15 locals that are actually going there by boat and 16 finding these fish that are in there. It seems like 17 there's several weather constraints in installing 18 cameras, so it seems to me that if you have boots on 19 the ground, it would be useful to take that information 20 while you're trying to get cameras installed.</p> <p>21 22 Also I would like to know some of the 23 biology behind these closures and what are the 24 thresholds that it will take to open up this fishery. 25 What are you looking for? I mean what's the percentage 26 of fish in the Unuk that you need to open this and how 27 close are we getting to that. I think those are all 28 areas that are not being expressed or looked at.</p> <p>29 30 So I'm very interested to know the 31 biology behind this and what's it going to take to open 32 this up. I think customary and traditional use is very 33 important and I think it's a very viable source of 34 information. If you have people that are providing 35 that, if they're taking pictures and able to send 36 pictures or whatever, I think that sometimes is better 37 than a camera that you're trying to look at in an 38 office or how much time is being set aside to watch a 39 camera looking for eulachon.</p> <p>40 41 So, I don't know. I think there's some 42 gaps in there and I don't think we're providing good 43 opportunity and we're not providing good science for 44 these people so that they can have an opportunity to 45 fish.</p> <p>46 47 Thank you.</p> <p>48 49 50</p>	<p>1 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 Terry, I had asked the question about the FRMP program 3 and if it was funding current monitoring efforts. If 4 so, I guess a follow up to that that I didn't state was 5 if it was on the four-year cycle, that monitoring 6 effort is going to be ending this year and now may not 7 potentially be funded next year dependent upon whatever 8 the budget is for projects.</p> <p>9 10 MR. SUMINSKI: Ms. Needham, that's 11 correct. That project ended this year and we are going 12 through and prioritizing what projects will continue on 13 in 2018. I expect we're going to have some level of 14 monitoring on the Unuk no matter what. Just a couple 15 comments. We absolutely appreciate and fully 16 incorporate any comments we get from users. That's our 17 best information by far. We have used that 18 information.</p> <p>19 20 As far as when to reopen, this isn't 21 like a salmon weir where we actually get numbers. It's 22 kind of -- I'll just show you what our comments for the 23 last few years were. Starting with 2012, the run was 24 good? '13, weak. 2014, very weak. 2015, moderate. 25 2016, good. 2017, moderate. So we don't have the kind 26 of quantifiable information that we would really like 27 to have like some sort of a number trigger to reopen 28 it.</p> <p>29 30 I think if we're starting to see a 31 trend of presence, a decent presence, I think we should 32 start having some conversations with the State about 33 some sort of a limited fishery just to see what's going 34 on and get a little more interest in it, gets more data 35 because it's not hard numbers that we would like. It's 36 very hard to quantify eulachon populations.</p> <p>37 38 I hope that helps. We really do 39 appreciate the input from Mr. Wagner and others that do 40 spend a lot of time on the river because we just can't 41 be there all the time like they are.</p> <p>42 43 Thank you.</p> <p>44 45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.</p> <p>46 47 Mr. Schroeder and then Mr. Yeager.</p> <p>48 49 MR. SCHROEDER: I'm glad that this 50</p>
Page 47	Page 49
<p>1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, Ms. Phillips. 2 Are you there, Patty?</p> <p>3 4 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, if you're 5 talking to me, I can't hear you. I want to say, thank 6 you, John, that was very well stated. Can you hear me?</p> <p>7 8 Over.</p> <p>9 10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, we hear you.</p> <p>11 12 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman 13 Bangs. I want to support what Councilman Yeager just 14 stated and also to try to lend support to the comment 15 that Mr. Wagner has been bringing forth upon multiple 16 meetings during our public comment period.</p> <p>17 18 As the Regional Advisory Council, in 19 our annual report we can recommend strategies for the 20 management of fish and wildlife populations to 21 accommodate subsistence uses and needs. ANILCA is to 22 protect and provide for continued subsistence uses on 23 Federal public lands by enabling rural residents who 24 have personal knowledge of local conditions and 25 requirements to have a meaningful role.</p> <p>26 27 In this situation we have a family that 28 has traditional ecological knowledge that they could 29 bring forth to the management of the eulachon on the 30 Unuk. I would suggest that we include this concern in 31 our annual report. We have cooperative agreements that 32 can be made through Section 809 with the Federal agency 33 U.S. Forest Service, with State Native corporations or 34 other appropriate persons to affect the purposes of 35 ANILCA.</p> <p>36 37 So I think that -- I'm glad to hear the 38 Forest Service is using electronic means, but let's 39 open up the opportunity for cooperative agreements with 40 those who have traditional ecological knowledge to 41 bring substantial evidence to the management of 42 eulachon on the Unuk.</p> <p>43 44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.</p> <p>45 46 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very much, 47 Patty. Thanks for your patience.</p> <p>48 49 Ms. Needham.</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 issue has come up and thank you for coming before us 2 one more time, Louie. In addition to the issue of 3 harvesting eulachon, which is definitely really 4 important for subsistence users, I would note that the 5 Unuk and perhaps other drainages in that area are 6 threatened by transboundary mines, specifically the KSM 7 mine, Kerr Sulphurets, Mitchell Mine and the Brucejack 8 Mine.</p> <p>9 10 The Council has been really concerned 11 about what happens to our transboundary waters. I'm 12 kind of thinking of bad case scenarios where down the 13 line if there is a major problem with Canadian mining 14 and then you're looking at what's the effect. If we 15 don't have good data on these drainages, we'd be left 16 saying, well, there used to be eulachon there, but it's 17 kind of sketchy and there used to be this there and 18 it's kind of sketchy. So I think we have additional 19 reason to pay attention to this.</p> <p>20 21 I'm sorry if I was a little harsh on 22 the Forest Service in my earlier comment.</p> <p>23 24 Thank you.</p> <p>25 26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.</p> <p>27 28 Mr. Yeager.</p> <p>29 30 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 31 While I appreciate your information, Mr. Suminski, on 32 your follow up there, having fished for several years 33 on the Stikine for eulachon I understand it's not 34 similar to a salmon return where you can have more hard 35 numbers. However, I would like to know what is the 36 Forest Service using that constitutes fair, moderate 37 and good. Just because you say it's good, where are 38 you getting good from.</p> <p>39 40 I feel that if it's good and it's 41 consistently good, whatever that means in your words, 42 why not give them a day of opening? We discussed that 43 and let's fish and look at what we get in the nets. 44 Those are hard numbers. We can look at that kind of 45 opportunity and at least crack this door a little bit 46 wider.</p> <p>47 48 In my mind, and I hate to hold a hard 49 line on this, but with an opportunity being missed 50</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 there I'm not satisfied with good, moderate or fair 2 because I don't know what that's based upon. 3 4 Thank you. 5 6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Stewart, do you 7 have a response? 8 9 Then Mr. Sensmeier. 10 11 MR. STEWART: I just wanted to follow 12 up with some of the discussion. I think it is our duty 13 and our responsibility to take the opportunistic 14 chances and figure that out. We have other processes 15 and protocols that actually determine how we would 16 react depending on the situation and the specific case. 17 I think it warrants the opportunity to have a more 18 deliberate dialogue I would offer and see what that 19 translates into because I don't know the process or the 20 procedures, but I certainly believe the biological 21 expertise exists to sort through that. 22 23 I also wanted to follow back to Member 24 Schroeder's comment. We're also working with the U.S. 25 Geologic Survey with a gauging station on the Unuk and 26 we're working through that process right now because 27 the same broader question about transboundary mine is 28 real, so we have multiple reasons and the rationales 29 way beyond eulachon I think that warrant additional 30 focus and emphasis on the Unuk. 31 32 Thank you, sir. 33 34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. 35 36 Mr. Sensmeier. 37 38 MR. SENSMEIER: Thank you, Mr. 39 Chairman. With respect to the transboundary mines, I'm 40 glad Mr. Schroeder brought that up. I mentioned it. I 41 didn't make last year's meeting, but the year before. 42 It's not only the Unuk, it's the Stikine and Wrangell. 43 the Taku in Juneau and Alek 40 miles from Yakutat. 44 45 With respect to the Unuk, the KSM Mine 46 is so large you can see it from outer space, from 47 satellites. When they build a mine, they make a huge 48 sand and gravel dam on the down valley side of it and 49 three or four hundred feet on the upper side. This 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 There's been some study by the biologist on this Unuk 2 River eulachon. It's a learning curve for them, not 3 knowing whether it's weak, moderate or good. You have 4 Mr. Wagner who has been there since 1960, minus maybe a 5 couple years, every year and he could tell you if it's 6 okay, not so good. He's never consulted and I think he 7 should be part of that. In my opinion, he'd qualify 8 for a PhD on the Unuk River. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. 11 12 Mr. Wagner. 13 14 MR. WAGNER, JR.: Thank you for that. 15 Just a little more information on how do the eulachon 16 run. They do run at night a lot. They spawn and they 17 leave as soon as they spawn most of the time. The Unuk 18 River is so small. It's way different than the other 19 rivers where they could hang around for a couple weeks. 20 They don't do that on the Unuk. You have to be there 21 ahead of time. 22 23 When we lay on the log up in the river 24 and put the flashlights down, you could see the fish 25 running and it's thick going up into the river. A lot 26 of times -- we've learned how to find them with the 27 skiff. People have come up and, wow, there's no 28 eulachon up here and they would leave and we'd just 29 smile. They're there. 30 31 And flying over you really can't see 32 them. You can't get down between the trees because 33 it's too narrow for the plane, so you're up there three 34 to five hundred feet over the river and it's near 35 impossible to see the eulachon in the river from an 36 airplane. You have to be down on the water to really 37 see them on the river there. 38 39 From the years and years of sitting on 40 the boat and watching, I know exactly what comes first 41 up to the river to feed on the eulachon and what is 42 following behind them. The seagulls are always the 43 most interesting because it's a steady stream when 44 they're coming up. There could be not much there one 45 day, but two, three days later the flats would be 46 covered in seagulls than prior days. 47 48 But it's a learning and a studying 49 experience, you know. Like I say you have to be there 50</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 one, the down valley dam will be higher than the Hoover 2 Dam, which is around 800 feet, I believe, and a lot 3 wider. It's five miles from the lower dam to the upper 4 dam, so that's huge, like Lake Mead or something like 5 that. They line that with a rubber lining and the 6 mining companies claim that that will last in 7 perpetuity. A lot of these areas are in highly seismic 8 areas. Not only Southeast but in Alaska and the 9 nation. 10 11 I traveled to British Columbia with Lt. 12 Governor Byron Mallott and State officials and the 13 Transboundary Mining Work Group and others, like Salmon 14 Without Borders, the Mount Polley Mine over there 15 three years ago breached and the tailings went into the 16 Fraser River and people were not allowed to fish it. It 17 also went into their drinking water supply. That 18 affects not only the people that depend upon that, but 19 all the animals and the birds and the fish and 20 everything else that depend on that as well. 21 22 A lot of these acid rock are kept in a 23 tailings pond and have to be submerged in at least four 24 feet of water. If they become exposed to the air, they 25 form sulfuric acid and I don't need to really expound 26 on that. 27 28 We're working now with -- Carrie is the 29 vice chair and with the Pelly Amendment, an 30 international agreement between Alaska and the United 31 States, and I'm not sure of the exact year, I think it 32 was in the '20s that agreement was made, which 33 specified that neither side would pollute or harm the 34 waters of the other side. 35 36 So I'm hoping this entity will be a 37 signatory to that. At AFN in Anchorage two weeks ago 38 the Bristol Bay Native Association signed on supporting 39 the Pelly Amendment. Not only to do with the mining 40 problem, but with Tier III as well. They're seeking 41 that status for the Bristol Bay Watershed. 42 43 Thank you. 44 45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. 46 47 Mr. Douville. 48 49 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 on the river to really know what's going on because 2 they don't hang around. The first is sometimes three 3 to five days they're trickling in so it doesn't look 4 like much, but when it peaks, like I would assume the 5 salmon on Bristol Bay, the river would be full. But 6 it's brief and you have to be there and get your fish 7 and leave. 8 9 Like I say, they don't hang around. 10 It's not a part-time deal. It's a once a year thing 11 and, like I say, you've got to be there. So it's 12 really important if you're going to monitor it, monitor 13 it properly, not just slide by. 14 15 No offense. 16 17 Thank you. 18 19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. 20 21 Mr. Stewart. 22 23 MR. STEWART: I would be remiss before 24 I stepped back by not recognizing and acknowledging Mr. 25 Wagner's experience, his knowledge and his persistence 26 on this particular issue. I continue to appreciate 27 that and recognize that from a biological expertise 28 standpoint there's always things to be learned by each 29 and every one of us, so we continue to value those 30 learning experiences as we move forward. 31 32 From a Tongass standpoint look forward 33 to working with the Council in trying to ascertain how 34 to look forward on this and gain the knowledge and 35 utilize the information we have. I would be remiss 36 also if I failed to recognize Ketchikan Indian 37 Community for their assistance on some of these 38 monitoring exercises who are in attendance today. 39 40 Thank you. 41 42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that. 43 Is there any other questions or comments. 44 45 (No comments) 46 47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I would have to say 48 that I agree with Patty. I think that the TEK is an 49 important tool that we should use more in our 50</p>

Page 54	Page 56
<p>1 monitoring of resources, whether it's wolves or 2 eulachon. It's just one of those things where, 3 especially as funding gets cut, we're not able to rely 4 on science from departments and agencies. So I think 5 it's one of those things where TEK is a valuable tool 6 we should take advantage of.</p> <p>7 8 Thank you.</p> <p>9 10 Thank you, Mr. Wagner.</p> <p>11 12 MR. WAGNER: Thank you.</p> <p>13 14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'd like to 15 acknowledge that Mr. Howard finally made it in on the 16 plane. We're glad to see you and welcome.</p> <p>17 18 Moving along with the agenda, we're 19 going to go to Board of Fish proposals and I think Ms. 20 Perry has some comments.</p> <p>21 22 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This 23 is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southeast 24 RAC. I just wanted to talk to the Council about the 25 two Board of Fish proposals that the Council submitted 26 after the March meeting and we have the Board of Fish 27 meeting coming up in January and the written comments 28 on these proposals should be submitted by the end of 29 December, December 28th.</p> <p>30 31 So I wanted to know if the Council 32 would like to submit any written comments to support 33 its proposal or possibly send someone to the Board of 34 Fish meeting in January. So I'm just putting that on 35 the table for discussion and possibly a motion if you 36 choose to take some action.</p> <p>37 38 Thank you.</p> <p>39 40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms. Perry.</p> <p>41 42 Any questions or comments.</p> <p>43 44 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Bangs, this is 45 Patty Phillips.</p> <p>46 47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Go ahead, Patty.</p> <p>48 49 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I think it's 50</p>	<p>1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: What's the wish of the 2 Council. Do we want to -- oh, Mr. Reifensuhl, follow 3 up.</p> <p>4 5 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Do we need a motion 6 to direct Staff to write -- well, research the issue 7 and send in additional comments and scientific backing 8 for the proposal. I mean somebody's got to do the 9 work, so I think if there is -- I think it would be 10 worthwhile to have Staff look at the issue and if there 11 is additional information to write such a letter.</p> <p>12 13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I agree, but I also 14 think some of us, myself, plan on talking with a local 15 biologist that would be aware of what's happening with 16 local stocks of concern around our community. I think 17 maybe we could all do that if there's some issues with 18 sockeye salmon in your area, then maybe contact your 19 local finfish biologist and see what their position is 20 and how they feel that underreporting or unaccounted 21 fish being taken how important it is to their being 22 able to manage those stocks.</p> <p>23 24 So I think we could all do a little bit 25 of that and it would go a long ways to getting some 26 substantial evidence to support our proposal and plus 27 staff doing some research. I think that would be a 28 good thing. What's the wish of the Council? Would the 29 Council like to do further direction towards Staff to 30 investigate more materials that we could use. I'm 31 seeing some nods and some blank looks.</p> <p>32 33 Cathy.</p> <p>34 35 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair. I guess I 36 would wonder what the timing was if we asked Staff to 37 do that and have it ready by December for the comments 38 that we submit. The Board of Fish meeting is in 39 January where?</p> <p>40 41 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Cathy. It's 42 January 11th through the 23rd in Sitka and as of last 43 week no specific agenda had been posted like when 44 they're going to do what proposals what day.</p> <p>45 46 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay. And then if we ask 47 for a person from this Council to be present to support 48 proposals that we put forth, they would have that 49 analysis that we ask Staff to do available to them by 50</p>
Page 55	Page 57
<p>1 very important that we come up with a much more 2 detailed comment to the Board of Fish. I noticed at 3 the last Board of Fish meeting in Sitka that those 4 proposals that had good background information to 5 support their proposals were more likely to get 6 passage.</p> <p>7 8 We actually did get a vote in support 9 of our proposal on sockeye and then they took a break 10 and came back the next day and rescinded that support. 11 I think we could do a better job of presenting 12 scientific information to support the reason why we 13 have the proposals before them.</p> <p>14 15 I'm going to have to sign off, Mr. 16 Chair. I'm supposed to head down.</p> <p>17 18 So thank you.</p> <p>19 20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that 21 Patty and thank you for phoning in. We appreciate your 22 comments and wish you were here.</p> <p>23 24 With that, Mr. Reifensuhl, do you have 25 a comment.</p> <p>26 27 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Yes, I would agree 28 with Patty. If there's more information, especially 29 scientific backing for the proposal, if that's not 30 already included in there, then it should go in by the 31 official closure of the 30th of December. But I don't 32 know if there is additional information. If there's 33 not, then I don't think additional comments are that 34 important, but it's very important to be there, for 35 somebody to represent this issue to testify in January.</p> <p>36 37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. 38 Reifensuhl. I agree wholeheartedly that it's most 39 important to have somebody there to support the 40 proposal. I do think that Patty is right though. We 41 need better representation from the research that we 42 come up with to back our proposal. I think with that 43 and someone being there to support it we'd have a lot 44 better chance of passing it.</p> <p>45 46 Any other comments.</p> <p>47 48 (No comments)</p> <p>49 50</p>	<p>1 that time, is that -- I'm just trying to wrap my head 2 around the process that you're asking.</p> <p>3 4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Steve.</p> <p>5 6 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Thank you. There's 7 two ways to do this. So you can have additional 8 comments submitted by the 30th, I think that's the 9 correct date, or you can take additional comments and 10 have on record comments at the meeting. So there is a 11 deadline, but that just means they get published. If 12 you go to the meeting and have additional information 13 by -- it's actually the 15th, the first four days of 14 that meeting is shellfish and then the latter days. So 15 it starts on the 15th for finfish, but you could submit 16 those comments then.</p> <p>17 18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Steve. I 19 think the way that the board of Fish still works, if 20 I'm not mistaken, is they take your comments. If you 21 give them to Staff Board support, they will print them 22 and give them to the Board members. I'm not sure if 23 they still do that, but I know that's one way to get 24 them -- but it's more effective, I think, if you do 25 written comments by the time period deadline and then 26 also show up and speak to the Board in person.</p> <p>27 28 I think that's the most effective way 29 that I've learned.</p> <p>30 31 Mr. Hernandez.</p> <p>32 33 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 34 Just a couple comments, questions here. I think this 35 proposal we're discussing primarily also is going to 36 require a lot of information from the Department of 37 Fish and Game on sport fish regulations and whatnot 38 and takes on these streams. So we're going to have to 39 have some cooperation between our Staff and Fish and 40 Game, so I hope that is possible.</p> <p>41 42 Also, the other question is are you 43 planning to attend the meeting yourself?</p> <p>44 45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I plan on trying to be 46 at that meeting. I don't have anything scheduled for 47 that time slot and I think it would be important for 48 somebody if someone else wants to be there as well, but 49 I would definitely want to be there. 50</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 Any other ideas or comments from the 2 Council. 3 4 Mr. Kitka. 5 6 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I 7 know I plan to be there. I'm sure Steve plans to be 8 there too. I'm not too sure who else is planning to be 9 there, but it would be nice -- I know there's a lot of 10 people that have talked about this proposal over the 11 time. It would be nice to get their written comments 12 because this is not really a scientific comment. This 13 is what people see. 14 15 It always amazed me to watch all the 16 boxes go out of Sitka or come in from the charter 17 people. They'll unload boxes and boxes of fish and 18 they'll be already filleted. When they're allowed 19 maybe two king salmon, I'm not sure how many cohos, but 20 when they -- I said how many fillets make a salmon. 21 It's really hard to see that that many boxes can come 22 in and go out of town and be more than just a few 23 salmon. 24 25 Thank you. 26 27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Harvey. 28 29 Anyone else. 30 31 Mr. Sensmeier. 32 33 MR. SENSMEIER: With respect to what 34 Mr. Kitka just said, I think that's a problem in a lot 35 of places. I know in Yakutat a lot of sporties come 36 and taking out a lot of boxes. I held the door for 37 four sports fishermen so they could take their boxes 38 into the airlines and they each had three boxes and I 39 asked one of them how many fish can you get in one box 40 and they said about 70 and that's because, as Harvey 41 said, they fillet them. So I held the door and one of 42 them said to the other one, when we get to Seattle 43 we've got to get this to the market right away. I 44 said, wow, 12 x 70 is a lot of fish. 45 46 Thank you. 47 48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ray. Any 49 other comments. 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 to see your process and see how that works. Ms. Perry 2 invited me to speak on the out-of-cycle process, but I 3 just want to highlight or give an overview on also the 4 Board of Game and Board of Fisheries regulatory process 5 and the Board Support Section Program. I'm primarily 6 going to speak on the Board of Game process. It's very 7 similar to the Board of Fisheries process, but there 8 are differences. 9 10 In regards to the Board of Fisheries, 11 one thing I do want to point out to the Council, per 12 your discussion you were just having, is that if you're 13 not aware they do have -- they utilize what's called a 14 committee of the whole process, so it usually occurs 15 after public testimony at their regulatory meeting, but 16 it's more informal. They'll have a discussion with 17 members of the audience about proposals and issues. 18 19 It's not a process the Board of Game 20 uses, so I can't speak to the details of that. I 21 couldn't tell you if every proposal goes through the 22 committee-of-the-whole process. I think it's more so 23 for more complicated issues, but I know many of the 24 proposals are part of that committee-of-the-whole 25 process. So whoever attends that meeting be sure to 26 watch for information on the committee-of-the-whole 27 process. 28 29 So to begin with, a quick overview 30 about the Board Support Section Program where small 31 staff housed under the Department of Fish and Game. 32 There are nine of us employed there, an executive 33 director for each Board. Myself for the Board of Game 34 and Glenn Haight for the Board of Fisheries. We have 35 five seasonal regional coordinator positions around the 36 state that assist coordinating the meetings for our 84 37 local advisory committees. 38 39 In Southeast, we have two members who 40 assist the Southeast advisory committees, but that's 41 not their position. They are actually publication 42 specialists who assist with each Board and then they 43 share the duties with the Southeast Regional Advisory 44 Committee. That slide is just a quick breakdown of the 45 number of ACs per region. 46 47 So I thought it might be helpful to 48 list some of the statutory authorities for primarily 49 the Board of Game, but also the Board of Fisheries. I 50</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 (No comments) 2 3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think we should 4 readdress this later in the meeting just to gather some 5 ideas visiting, so who can go and who wants to go. I 6 don't know that the agency has the money to send 7 anyone, but I think we'll have representation there 8 regardless and I'm willing to go there on my own dime. 9 I just think it's a very important issue. There's too 10 much unaccountability and I think it's something we 11 need to push strong. 12 13 Anyway, with that said, unless anybody 14 else has any comments we'll move on. Do you have any 15 other questions, Ms. Perry? 16 17 MS. PERRY: Not at this time. Thank 18 you, Chair. 19 20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you. 21 Next up is the State out-of-cycle process presentation 22 by Ms. Kristy Tibbles. Are you online? Or, no, you're 23 here. Oh, good. 24 25 MS. TIBBLES: Good morning. For the 26 record, my name is Kristy Tibbles and I'm the Executive 27 Director for the Alaska Board of Game. I have sent my 28 presentation to Ms. Perry, so I'm assuming she's going 29 to pull it up there on the screen for me and I've also 30 brought copies and handed them to the person in the 31 back and I don't know if they're also given to you or 32 if those are for the public, but I do have copies 33 handy. 34 35 I want to thank the Council very much 36 for inviting me to speak on the Board of Game out-of- 37 cycle processes. I normally sit on that side of the 38 table for the Board of Game and rarely do presentations 39 in front of the board, so I may be a little nervous and 40 you'll have to forgive me if my presentation isn't as 41 polished as some of the other presenters. 42 43 Of course process isn't always as 44 interesting as the biological issues or the 45 socioeconomic information, so it's not glamorous, but 46 it's important to understand the process to be 47 effective before the State regulatory process. 48 49 On that I appreciate being here to get 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 realized here in my presentation I use AS a lot, so if 2 you're not familiar with what that is, that's the 3 Alaska Statute. So 16.05.221 establishes both Boards 4 for the purpose of conservation and development of the 5 resources. Each Board has seven members that are 6 appointed by the governor, confirmation by the 7 legislature. They serve three-year terms. 8 9 Then the last bullet says that they are 10 appointed on the basis of interest in public affairs, 11 good judgment, knowledge, and ability in the field of 12 action of the board, and with a view to providing 13 diversity of interest and points of view in the 14 membership. That is the only qualification for Board 15 of Game and Board of Fisheries members. They're not 16 selected to represent regions of the state or user 17 groups or interests. Once they're appointed as a 18 Board, they are to represent the state of Alaska. 19 20 I'm just going to run through some key 21 authorities in statutes. Some of them not so key, but 22 are of interest. AS 16.05.255 sets out the regulation- 23 making authority for the Board of Game. This includes 24 opening and closing seasons, setting quotas, bag 25 limits, harvests, establishing methods and means of 26 take. 27 28 Regulations must provide that taking of 29 moose, deer, elk, and caribou for personal or family 30 consumption has preference over taking by nonresidents. 31 Intensive management, encouraging adults to take 32 children hunting. That's not a complete list, but 33 those are some of the more common regulations that they 34 deal with. Similar for Board of Fisheries their 35 regulation authority falls under 16.05.221. 36 37 The next one, a key one, 16.05.258 38 deals with subsistence, so applies to both Board of 39 Game and Board of Fisheries, to identify game 40 populations, customary and traditional use for 41 subsistence and determine the amount of the harvestable 42 surplus as reasonably necessary for subsistence. 43 44 These last three just some ones of 45 interest. It's actually defined in statute that they 46 shall hold at least one meeting a year and many others 47 as needed. A majority of the full Board membership is 48 required to carry all motions, regulations and 49 resolutions. 50</p>

1 Our advisory committee system is set
2 under statute, so it allows both Boards to -- both
3 Boards need to come together as a body to establish the
4 local fish and game advisory committees and they have
5 and we have the 84 advisory committees.

6
7 Another one of interest that I didn't
8 put up there still in statute but it describes how a
9 Board of Game, Board of Fisheries or Joint Board
10 meeting is called. It's upon two members of each Board
11 or the Commissioner can call a Board meeting.

12
13 So I just wanted to make sure everyone
14 is aware of the Board of Game meeting cycle. The Board
15 considers regulations for six regions and statewide
16 regulations every three years. They began the three-
17 year cycle in 2016. Prior to that they considered
18 regions every two years.

19
20 So this current meeting cycle the Board
21 of Game is covering statewide regulations. That
22 meeting is coming up quick, in a week and a half in
23 Anchorage. Then they'll have the Central Southwest
24 Region meeting later in February and that meeting will
25 be held in Dillingham.

26
27 Next year we have the Southeast Region
28 and Southcentral Region, then the following year
29 Interior Western and Arctic and after that we circle
30 back to the statewide regulations in Central Southwest.

31
32 The Board sets their meeting dates and
33 locations, so coming up at this November meeting in a
34 week and a half at their work session they'll set the
35 meeting dates and the location for the Southeast Region
36 meeting. Likely to be next January is when they
37 typically have the Southeast Region meeting. They tend
38 to cycle through locations. So they've met in Sitka,
39 Ketchikan, Wrangell, Juneau. Petersburg is an area
40 they haven't met, so that may be the location we see
41 the Board goes, but again it's their decision on where
42 to hold that meeting.

43
44 I feel it will be helpful for you to
45 understand the State's regulatory process before we
46 talk about the out-of-cycle actions. This slide is
47 specific to the Board of Game. We start with the call
48 for proposals. May 1 is the Board of Game deadline. I
49 should have clarified on this slide. Different from
50

1 the Board of Fisheries which is April 10 every year.

2
3 About 9 to 12 months prior to their
4 Board meetings we will issue a call for proposals for
5 the Board of Game. The deadlines are set after the
6 deadlines. The proposals are reviewed by Board Support
7 Staff with assistance from other department staff and
8 Department of Law. They're reviewed to make sure they
9 make the call for proposals and then they are compiled
10 in a book that is printed and distributed to the
11 public.

12
13 The advisory committees, agencies are
14 reviewing them, Department of Fish and Game, to provide
15 comments to the Boards for their consideration at their
16 regulatory meetings. After that, before the Board
17 meetings, we're soliciting comments. Both Boards set a
18 comment deadline approximately two weeks prior to that
19 meeting.

20
21 That's what we call the on-time public
22 comment deadline, so we want to encourage the comments
23 to come in by that deadline because we will put it in
24 the workbook. We cross-reference them with the
25 proposals for the Board members to be able to help them
26 with sorting their comments. Then those comments are
27 available online early in advance so that the Board
28 members can begin reviewing them.

29
30 Our meetings include an oral hearing
31 where people can sign up to testify, usually given five
32 minutes, but our advisory committees and the Regional
33 Advisory Council Members are provided extra time. For
34 Board of Game it's 15 minutes. I think the Board of
35 Fisheries is a little less. I think they're doing 10
36 minutes instead of 15 minutes.

37
38 After the oral hearing of a specific
39 regulatory meeting, then the Boards will act on the
40 proposals and they have the ability to amend the
41 proposals if they need to and of course their actions
42 are usually to carry or fail the proposals, amend.

43
44 Once the Board meeting is over the
45 actions taken by the Board are put into the proper
46 legal format for regulations. They are then submitted
47 to the Lt. Governor. The Lt. Governor will sign -- we
48 also refer to that as filing the regulations and
49 regulations normally, for State agencies, are
50

1 implemented 30 days after the Lt. Governor signs or
2 files those regulations. For the Board of Game we
3 usually specify there will be an effective date July 1
4 and that correlates with the hunting regulations that
5 regulatory year.

6
7 I just wanted to point out the State
8 process for Board of Game and Board of Fisheries as
9 well as all State agencies they have to adhere to the
10 Administrative Procedures Act, which is in AS 40.462.
11 Boards of Fisheries and Games as well as maybe a couple
12 other Boards are given special provisions under the
13 Administrative Procedures Act, so there's some
14 differences between the Boards and then just regular
15 State agencies the way they adopt their regulations.

16
17 Some things under the Administrative
18 Procedures Act that define the fish and game regulatory
19 process include providing public notice on proposed
20 regulations, which we have to provide 30 days notice,
21 and then there are a number of steps on how we're
22 required to distribute that notice to the public.

23
24 There's provisions in there stating how
25 all government entities their meetings are open to the
26 public, including the Boards, so whenever we have a
27 quorum of Board members that's considered an open
28 public meeting and the public needs to be noticed of
29 that open meeting.

30
31 The Boards do have ability to meet for
32 social events where they're not talking about any
33 regulatory action and that is allowed, but otherwise,
34 if they're coming together to discuss issues or take
35 actions, that needs to be an open public meeting.

36
37 The APA requires the Board to pay
38 special attention to the cost to private persons for
39 the proposed regulatory changes. So during their
40 deliberations that's something they're paying attention
41 to and when they're about to take action on proposals
42 they'll acknowledge whether they feel there's a cost to
43 private persons or not. Adopted regulations have to
44 have a reasonable basis. That's described under the
45 Administrative Procedures Act.

46
47 I threw this one on there just for
48 interest, but if the Board chooses to go into executive
49 session, that's also described under the Administrative
50

1 Procedures Act and the purposes that they can go into
2 an executive session.

3
4 Oh, and I skipped one. Adoption of
5 emergency regulations when necessary. We'll talk a
6 little bit about that under the out-of-cycle actions.
7 The Boards have that ability to adopt emergency
8 regulations, which can be implemented almost
9 immediately, but they have to follow the process
10 identified under the Administrative Procedures Act.

11
12 I guess I'll ask if there's any
13 questions before I speak on the out-of-cycle actions or
14 I can continue if not.

15
16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are there any
17 questions from the Council.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'd like to give Ms.
22 Perry a brief moment to explain something.

23
24 MS. PERRY: For the record, this is
25 DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator. First, thank you,
26 Kristy, for coming kind of last minute. Kristy was
27 supposed to come join us this afternoon, but we've been
28 plowing through our agenda really quick, so thank you
29 for coming a little bit sooner.

30
31 I just wanted to remind the Council
32 that the reason that I asked Kristy to come and talk
33 about out-of-cycle actions and how we might do those,
34 if you'll remember in March's meeting when I think it
35 was Patty talked about doing a wolf proposal out of
36 cycle, I wrote myself a note that it might be a good
37 opportunity for us to get educated on that.

38
39 It's my understanding that Southeast
40 proposals are just around the corner, so maybe not this
41 time around because I think in just a couple months
42 they'll be taking those proposals, but just for future
43 benefit. So I just wanted to remind you kind of why
44 we're talking about out of cycle.

45
46 Thank you, Kristy.

47
48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms. Perry.
49
50

1 MS. TIBBLES: So I'm going to cover the
2 out-of-cycle procedures. There's four I've identified
3 here. The main one is called the agenda change request
4 process. I'll refer to that as the ACR. Both Boards
5 have policies under their own regulations for the
6 agenda change requests. They're very similar, but
7 there are differences. The deadline actually is a
8 difference between the two ACR policies.

9 I'm going to go ahead and say this now
10 because I might forget later. The Board of Game has a
11 proposal before them at their upcoming November meeting
12 to change the agenda change request policy. It will
13 change the deadline, but it will also change the
14 criteria. So, if that's adopted, it will be effective
15 next regulatory cycle, so starting July 1. So the
16 information I cover today may be slightly different
17 next year.

18 So the agenda change request policy.
19 There's a joint Board emergency petition policy that's
20 joint Board, so it applies to both. There are no
21 differences between the Boards. A Board-generated
22 proposal is also a joint Board policy and then
23 subsistence proposal policy is also a joint Board
24 policy. Both Boards follow those last three.

25 So the agenda change request policy is
26 in regulation 5AAC Chapter 92.005. That's a Board of
27 Game regulation. The deadline is 60 days prior to the
28 first Board meeting whereas Board of Fisheries is a set
29 date every year. I believe it's August 17th. For the
30 Board of Game, once that deadline passes, we will
31 collect our ACRs and prepare them for the Board.

32 The Board will have to come together in
33 an open meeting to address those ACRs. So the way
34 we've been doing that the past couple years is that
35 we'll hold a Board of Game teleconference, they will
36 review the ACRs and either accept or deny the ACRs.
37 Different from the Board of Fisheries.

38 The Board of Fisheries has an annual
39 usually two-day work session in Anchorage in October.
40 They'll review all of the ACRs that were submitted and
41 any that are accepted they schedule them for the future
42 meetings in that meeting cycle.

43 Both Board policies state that the

1 Board will accept an ACR only for conservation purpose,
2 correct errors, unforeseen effect and predominantly not
3 for allocative reasons unless there is new information
4 before the Board. And then both policies state that
5 they can accept an agenda change request for
6 coordination with Federal agencies, programs and laws.

7 I guess I mentioned this a little bit
8 before, but the ACRs accepted by either Board is
9 scheduled for one of the meetings within that upcoming
10 meeting cycle. Board support will publish that, post
11 it on our website, let our advisory committees know,
12 try to inform the public of that added agenda item.

13 I'll touch a little bit on the Joint
14 Board Petition Policy. It's primarily used for
15 petitions that are considered emergency situations. So
16 this will allow the Board of Fisheries and the Board of
17 Game to adopt the emergency regulations, which I
18 mentioned earlier could be effective immediately upon
19 filing by the Lt. Governor.

20 Different than regular regulations,
21 it's 30 days after the Lt. Governor signs, but if the
22 Board of Fisheries and Board of Game finds that an
23 emergency exists, then upon submission to the Lt.
24 Governor he will sign and then they're effective
25 immediately. They will expire in 120 days. That's
26 different than regular regulations, but the Boards have
27 the options to make those regulations permanent.

28 We don't see a lot of petitions come in
29 to the Boards. For Board of Game we've actually only
30 had one petition in the last few years, but types that
31 I'll see for Board of Game a lot of them deal with
32 weather and people in rural Alaska are unable to get
33 their moose or caribou, so they'll ask for a season
34 extension or change in bag limit.

35 It gets a little confusing here because
36 the Department of Fish and Game, separate from the
37 Boards, has authority to issue emergency orders.
38 Completely different process than the emergency
39 petition process. So for a lot of those requests to
40 extend a season the Department will review the
41 information and under their authority, if they feel
42 they can do so, they can extend a season that way.

43 So the criteria in order for the Board

1 to find an emergency is that it's an unforeseen,
2 unexpected event that either threatens a fish or game
3 resource or an unforeseen, unexpected resource
4 situation where biologically allowable resource harvest
5 would be precluded by delayed regulatory action and
6 such delay would be significantly burdensome to the
7 petitioners because the resource would be unavailable
8 in the future.

9 The second bullet I'll point out it's
10 part of their policy, but that actually comes from the
11 Administrative Procedures Act for when agencies and the
12 Boards are considering emergency regulations. It
13 states in there they will be held to a minimum and are
14 rarely found to exist. Again, when the Boards are
15 considering those types of petitions, it must meet that
16 criteria.

17 When the petitions come in and they are
18 -- you know, could come in the summer, it's more than
19 30 days prior to one of the Board's regulatory
20 meetings, they can delegate to the Commissioner. They
21 have a standing delegation to allow the Commissioner to
22 review the petition and make a decision whether he
23 feels an emergency exists or not. So that gives him
24 the ability to actually deny the petition if he feels
25 otherwise, but if he feels there is an emergency he can
26 call a special meeting of either Board to address that
27 petition.

28 If he were to deny a petition, all that
29 information is still shared with the Board members and
30 so that if they felt that the petition needed to be --
31 that he was wrong or they disagreed with his
32 determination, they could call a meeting. It takes only
33 two Board members to call a special Board meeting.

34 Both Boards at times will create Board-
35 generated proposals. In 2013, they felt it would be
36 helpful for the public to understand what reasons would
37 they want -- what they need to consider when creating
38 Board-generated proposals. So there is a policy. It's
39 assigned a number. It's on our website. It's that
40 number 2013-34JB for joint Board.

41 When Boards are considering Board-
42 generated proposals, they need to consider is it in the
43 public's best interest, is there urgency in considering
44 the issue, are the current processes insufficient to

1 bring the subject to the Board's attention and will
2 there be reasonable and adequate opportunity for public
3 comment.

4 We don't regularly see Board-generated
5 proposals, at least for the Board of Game. There are
6 reasons that will pop up. If it's past the agenda
7 change request, there's an issue that needs to be
8 addressed, maybe the Department of Law, Department of
9 Fish and Game has brought an issue to the Board's
10 attention, but it doesn't meet that threshold for
11 emergency regulations either.

12 They can request a Board-generated
13 proposal on the topic and schedule that out for a
14 future meeting and it will be considered as regulatory
15 change. So that's where in accordance with the
16 Administrative Procedures Act we have to provide at
17 least 30 days notice to the public that they've added
18 that proposal to their agenda.

19 Lastly, there is a Subsistence Proposal
20 Policy. It's in regulation 5 AAC 96.615 for both
21 boards, as I mentioned. It's one that's rarely used.
22 I'll explain why if you go down the bullets. It must
23 be submitted by the designated deadline, so that
24 proposal deadline. If we receive something by those
25 proposal deadlines, then this Subsistence Proposal
26 Policy would come into play if it meets the next few
27 criteria. That just often doesn't happen. We just
28 have not been receiving subsistence-type proposals.

29 Let me read the criteria to further
30 explain. It says the proposal must address a fish and
31 game population that has not previously been considered
32 by the Board for identification as a population
33 customarily and traditionally used for subsistence or
34 the circumstances of the proposal otherwise must
35 require expedited consideration by the Board, such as
36 the result of a court decision that might impact State
37 game management authority.

38 The policy goes on to say that the
39 Board may delegate to a review committee, consisting of
40 members of the Board. They may decline to act for any
41 reason. And that's it. As I mentioned, it doesn't
42 come into play very often, but it is a tool there for
43 both Boards if needed.

Page 70	Page 72
<p>1 So that is all I have to say about -- I 2 know there's one other piece that I'm forgetting. It 3 just popped out of my mind, so if I think about it, 4 I'll let you know, but that's it for the out-of-cycle 5 processes for both -- primarily for Board of Game, but 6 also touched on Board of Fisheries. I'll welcome your 7 questions. Our contact information is on that first or 8 second slide so you know how to track us down if you do 9 have questions.</p> <p>10 Thank you.</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms. 12 Tibbles. Are there any questions for Ms. Tibbles.</p> <p>13 (No comments)</p> <p>14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I have one quick 15 question. If the Board of Game does change the 16 criteria for ACR, does that mean it will be different 17 than the Board of Fish or is it going to be across the 18 board?</p> <p>19 MS. TIBBLES: Mr. Chair, correct. 20 Right now the criteria are the same and that is going 21 to change it from the Board of Fisheries.</p> <p>22 I won't take too long, but I failed to 23 mention the criteria they're considering in that 24 proposal. It's the same criteria as under that joint 25 Board petition policy that I mentioned. So it's an 26 unforeseen event that threatens a resource or 27 unforeseen situation that would preclude biologically 28 allowable resource harvest.</p> <p>29 So for the Board of Game -- and I don't 30 believe so much for Board of Fisheries, but Board of 31 Game has kind of struggled with that vague term for 32 conservation reason. They've kind of been inconsistent 33 on how they apply the conservation criteria for 34 different agenda chance requests. So this just further 35 clarifies it for them and gives them some better 36 guidance on what constitutes a conservation concern.</p> <p>37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you for 38 that. Anyone else have a question.</p> <p>39 (No comments)</p>	<p>1 a number of parties that have helped with that from 2 Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Hydaburg 3 group in helping to expand the surveys and inventory 4 information to help provide additional information and 5 I think that's certainly one of the prerequisites for 6 good information, as much information as you can and as 7 opportunistically working through that process.</p> <p>8 Subsistence is a critical component to 9 any project and I'll close with my initial thoughts by 10 recognizing that yesterday in the Wrangell Island 11 timber sale formal objection meetings, through that 12 Wrangell Island project I got my first comment through 13 the objections associated with subsistence specifically 14 on an individual that was interested, Wrangell Island 15 specifically, associated with hunting moose and game.</p> <p>16 Along with that it's my first 17 opportunity to actually modify a decision specifically 18 for subsistence means and solely that and I thought it 19 was really great to see that. The tools utilized 20 within the objection process and specifically see 21 subsistence come in as a comment from an objector and 22 then work through the process and we effectively worked 23 through that objector's concerns and got a withdrawal 24 of that particular objection yesterday.</p> <p>25 So it is opportunistic, it is timely 26 and I think it displays the opportunity to work and 27 operate differently as we move forward.</p> <p>28 With that I will yield to my colleagues 29 here at the table.</p> <p>30 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman and the 31 Council. For the record my name is Ryan Scott. I'm 32 the Wildlife Regional Supervisor for the Department of 33 Fish and Game here in Juneau. Thank you for an 34 opportunity to come before the Council again and talk 35 about this specific subject.</p> <p>36 The Wolf Technical Report was a long 37 time in coming. We brought a lot of different people 38 in to make sure we weren't going off the rail, so to 39 speak, and to look at both biological and practical 40 aspects of how do we look at -- you know, it's pretty 41 basic. You've got to have habitat for wolves and that 42 connects the deer very quickly and how do we provide 43 for that habitat for wolves thinking about all these</p>
Page 71	Page 73
<p>1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very much 2 for your time in giving us this information. I think 3 it's going to help us go through the process a lot 4 smoother, especially out of cycle.</p> <p>5 Thank you.</p> <p>6 MS. TIBBLES: Thank you and good luck 7 with the rest of your meeting.</p> <p>8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Okay. We 9 have one more thing we need to cover before lunch and 10 it's the Wolf Technical Committee report. The U.S. 11 Forest Service. Go ahead.</p> <p>12 MR. STEWART: We weren't sure how you 13 wanted to approach this, Mr. Chairman, Members of the 14 Council. I'll offer a couple of initial thoughts and 15 then we'll just see where it takes us and certainly 16 yield to my colleagues with Alaska Department of Fish 17 and Game and the Forest Service.</p> <p>18 I know this topic drew a lot of 19 interest and a lot of dialogue the last time we 20 discussed it and I recognize with any technical report 21 it's always a challenge of how to engage, how to 22 properly engage, how to make sure that we fulfill all 23 of our requirements and all of our duties and it 24 becomes difficult to wade your way through that.</p> <p>25 I would offer that relative to GMU 2 we 26 currently have the Prince of Wales landscape level 27 assessment going on, which is a direct application or 28 opportunistic application, I guess, of some of the 29 components within the technical report. That offers a 30 chance with the Council and with members of the public 31 to have the direct on-the-ground kind of application 32 and discussion and dialogue that's necessary.</p> <p>33 I have to recognize that members of the 34 Council may have been involved in that Prince of Wales 35 landscape assessment team and members of the 36 communities over there, but if you're not it is a very 37 broad, large-scale effort that I think is the 38 opportunity to have a much more deliberate and specific 39 dialogue and discussion associated with the Wolf 40 Technical Report.</p> <p>41 I also have to recognize that there are</p>	<p>1 other disciplines, deer management, forest practices 2 and everything that goes along with that.</p> <p>3 Over time it was sometimes somewhat 4 contentious. Even though you get a bunch of 5 bureaucrats in the same room we can figure out ways to 6 argue and we did that, but I think that the result came 7 out very well. I'm happy that the report has been 8 published, it's out there. Hopefully this group has 9 had an opportunity to look through it over the last 10 several months since we first talked about it in March 11 when we were down in Craig.</p> <p>12 If there's any specific questions, I'm 13 happy to answer some of those and as a final thought to 14 leave with you that that report is intended to be used 15 as recommendations and guideline type things that as we 16 move into the future, whether it be the Prince of Wales 17 LLA, you know, Wrangell is outside of Unit 2, but it 18 can be used to -- as we start to go other places in 19 Southeast Alaska. Second growth timber management, 20 things like that.</p> <p>21 That's the intent of the report. I'm 22 proud that the Department was able to be a part of it 23 and it was a good relationship working with not only 24 the Forest Service but Fish and Wildlife Service as 25 well.</p> <p>26 Thank you.</p> <p>27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.</p> <p>28 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. For the record, 29 Wayne Owen with the Forest Service, Alaska Region here 30 in Juneau. I'll only add a small comment to my 31 distinguished colleagues' testimony so far.</p> <p>32 It's always a struggle for land 33 management agencies as you all well know for us to rely 34 on the best available science where the science is 35 sometimes difficult to acquire and difficult to 36 understand.</p> <p>37 I think if you look back -- and I'm 38 reflecting a lot on what Louie said earlier, but if you 39 reflect back on the history of wolf management on 40 Prince of Wales Island, it's been a story of evolution 41 of our understanding of the animals on that island and</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 the Board of Game and the State and the Forest Service 2 trying to catch up with that and trying to do the best 3 with the information that we have so that we can all -- 4 all the Federal agencies and the State agencies do what 5 is right by all potential users. 6 7 We understand sometimes that the people 8 that live on the island have a different -- you know, 9 or live in a local area, have a different perspective, 10 a different experience with things. That's why we're 11 grateful for groups like the Hydaburg Cooperative 12 Association who stood up and said we are going to be 13 involved in this and we are going to help the Forest 14 Service and the State acquire the best available 15 information in order to help manage those populations. 16 17 That's all. 18 19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Owen. 20 Are there any questions for the time being? Are you 21 guys going to be here after lunch for questions if it 22 arises? What I was going to do is ask the Council to 23 make sure that they've looked over the report so that 24 they could possibly have more insight. Because we're 25 going to get into the proposals here pretty soon and 26 there may be some correlation questions. 27 28 So I was just wondering if you were 29 going to be available. 30 31 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chairman. I do have a 32 commitment from 2:00 to 2:30, but I'll be around 33 otherwise, yes, sir. 34 35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Mr. Scott will 36 be here. 37 38 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I'll be here, 39 yes, sir. 40 41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you. Is 42 there any questions at this time that might be 43 addressed quickly? 44 45 Mr. Hernandez. 46 47 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. 48 Chairman. I just kind of have some overall questions, 49 maybe combined with some comments. Reading this 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 annually. 2 3 Yes. Excuse me. 4 5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Can I just kind of 6 comment here? Those numbers that you just quoted, they 7 are not accomplishing what is in this report. Those 8 thinning dollars are spent primarily to promote future 9 timber production. There's numerous, numerous things 10 that I've highlighted in here where it's pointed out 11 that the monies that have been spent are not 12 accomplishing habitat restoration. It's more geared 13 towards economic viability for the timber industry in 14 the future. 15 16 So I just wanted to make that -- let's 17 not talk about what's being done necessarily now 18 because I don't think it's all that relevant. What are 19 we looking at for the future? 20 21 MR. STEWART: At this point in time I 22 don't know because there's not actually a specific 23 decision that's been made. When you look at Prince of 24 Wales landscape level assessment, I'm looking at a 25 decision something in the wintertime, like March or so, 26 in 2019. At that point in time we'll have more clarity 27 to the actual specific actions. 28 29 I think that everybody recognizes that 30 if you look at all treatments across that entire suite 31 of actions, whether it's timber management, whether 32 it's special use application associated with cell phone 33 towers, whether it's recreation developments or whether 34 it's fish and wildlife developments, there's going to 35 be some balancing that's necessary before we get to a 36 final decision. 37 38 So, unfortunately, I can't give any 39 specifics other than past actions that we've taken and 40 trying to pursue going forward. I'll have to wait until 41 we get to a final decision on Prince of Wales. 42 43 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'd also like to 44 point out that the Forest Service has spent a lot of 45 money thinning acreage that has now been transferred to 46 State and Native corporation lands, which the habitat 47 is not going to benefit at all from those lands. 48 There's some discussions to be had about this in the 49 future. It's going to be a big part of the discussions 50</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 report, which I tried to do thoroughly and I made 2 numerous highlights here, but I won't get into all of 3 them, but I would say that the general feeling for me 4 in this whole thing is this Wolf Management Habitat 5 Report is really deer habitat management to a large 6 degree, which of course is a major concern to all of 7 us. 8 9 A lot of what those concerns are relate 10 to land management practices that happened in the past 11 that need to be remedied. This report goes into quite a 12 bit of detail about how you hope to accomplish some of 13 these remedies. Of course we will be looking as we go 14 into the future how to avoid repeating those past 15 mistakes, I guess. I do want to say that I think land 16 management practices in the past were some huge 17 mistakes and I think you probably acknowledge that now 18 in retrospect. 19 20 So I guess my immediate question is 21 some of these remediations that are proposed in here a 22 lot of them have to do with kind of trying to restore 23 habitat through thinning procedures and there are all 24 kinds of prescriptions proposed as how best to go about 25 that. Kind of the one obvious observation I have on 26 all that is they strike me as being very expensive to 27 accomplish to really get the desired effect. 28 29 Without getting into a whole lot of 30 detail, what is the commitment looking forward? These 31 very expensive remedies that are proposed, what is the 32 commitment by the Forest Service to actually see that 33 these can get done and going into the future practice 34 that -- you know, this whole transition into second 35 growth, which is a big part of this landscape level 36 analysis that we're going to be talking about on Prince 37 of Wales island, a lot of it's tied up in what is 38 economical to do. What is the commitment by the Forest 39 Service to see that the economics of some of this will 40 be viable? 41 42 MR. STEWART: Thank you for the 43 question. I'll attempt to answer what parts I can 44 recognizing that within any Federal system or any State 45 system the financial wherewithal in future years is 46 always an unknown. At this point in time from a 47 thinning standpoint the Tongass pursues 38,000 acres of 48 treatment annually. We're in the process of raising 49 that up to something in the order of 6,000 acres 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 on the landscape level analysis. I think we all agree 2 on that. 3 4 Thank you. 5 6 MR. OWEN: If I might add, Mr. Chair, 7 the board member is absolutely correct that the 8 document focuses a lot on timber stand management, but 9 there are other components of this that we could 10 operationalize now. I'll give you a specific example 11 of road density. That is an issue that's deeply tied 12 with social license on the island. You'll see from 13 some of the tables in the document that the road 14 densities in certain areas on prince of Wales Island 15 are more than two, close to three times what the models 16 tell us is optimal. 17 18 I'm not saying anybody has done 19 anything bad or neglected anything. I think we all 20 recognize the difficulty when a district ranger or a 21 Federal official takes a look at a road and wants to 22 close it and people in the community are used to using 23 those roads for access. It would be really helpful for 24 deer habitat and wolf conservation if there was a forum 25 on Prince of Wales Island in which people could come 26 together and make joint decisions about where the 27 important roads are to keep open and where roads could 28 be closed. 29 30 Now the Tongass National Forest went 31 through a process like that several years ago with 32 tribal management. The wolf issue has become a much 33 bigger issue since that time. I don't know that we 34 necessarily have to do a big public process with lots 35 of money in NEPA. 36 37 There's certainly an opportunity on the 38 island to work with Fish and Game and the community of 39 trappers and hunters that use wolves and deer hunters, 40 especially the Federally qualified users on the island 41 as compared to the people that come over from Ketchikan 42 to use that. And protect what they need and what's 43 essential for people to get their subsistence and help 44 guide us to where we can do some conservation that 45 doesn't adversely effect the community. 46 47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. 48 49 Follow up, Mr. Hernandez. 50</p>

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The third component of this whole report. I'd say transportation management, big factor. The other thing is the conservation strategy on old growth reserves and how those are going to be affected here going into the future. Could you maybe comment on how committed the Forest Service is to following this conservation strategy for old growth reserves?

I know it's also going to be part of the discussion, economics, going into the future. How important -- you know, the industry is going to make a lot of push to get more old growth. Are you committed to maintaining these old growth reserves that are recommended in this habitat report?

MR. STEWART: So a very intriguing question that has a whole host of individual components. So for the benefit of the Council if you've had a chance to look at some of the press lately you've recognized that Government Accountability Office has determined that the 2016 plan amendment was determined to be a rule and as such then it's subject to Congressional Review Act.

At this point in time the agency is simply trying to assess what that means from an application standpoint. So unfortunately I really don't know what's going to come about in the future. I apologize, sir. I just don't have any specificity at this point in time. We're in a little bit of a different place.

MR. OWEN: Through the Chair. I will highlight the fact that the Forest Service has regularly, consistently and stridently supported the conservation strategy through litigation. Most recently Big Thorne timber sale. The conservation strategy was a key component of opposition to that and we worked really hard to defend that.

I think at my office here in Juneau and I know for a fact that in Ketchikan at the Forest Supervisor's Office we're all strongly united, locked close together about the importance of the conservation strategy as it exists and the importance to maintaining not just wolves and deer, but all the biodiversity of the Tongass.

One of my questions back to you is how do you prioritize the recommendations that are made within and get them implemented? Like what is the next step plan now that this document is available aside from LLA?

MR. STEWART: Probably the LLA is the easiest way to approach this as a response. We look at this as a toolkit of potential actions that a line officer could pursue taking on with the Prince of Wales Landscape Level Assessment, in the process of going through that and getting what I would say is a collaborative community-based kind of thoughts into that.

There were certain items selected and recognized as components that should go forward with an analysis such as that one as we would go to the next analysis it might be a different situation or setting or even a different application, but once again go back to this as a tool set of potential options or actions that the local line officer can take on to seek to remedy, resolve or reflect up on whatever the issue is that they're trying to respond to.

Beyond that I'd yield to my colleagues if they have any specific thoughts beyond that.

MR. OWEN: Through the Chair. Ms. Needham. You know well we've talked about this before, Lord help us from cookie cutter one size fits all solutions. As you recognize, there are a lot of options and opportunities in this document purposefully. It's not to confuse things or just to throw a handful of change on the floor. It's to give not just line officers but the public a full view of the optional tools that we have so that we can plan to a specific place, to a specific objective.

Not just your group but all members of the public have access and say what about this thing on page 18, why aren't you doing that, and have us respond to that by trying to be transparent and outlining what all the options that we could think of are available and maybe spur some others from the public.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Have any follow up?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Anyone else.

Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman. Just a brief comment. These roads aren't used just to get deer and wolf. I mean that's a couple months of the year. They're used to get firewood and bark, a number of other things. So the concentration should be not just on those two things. I believe that the Big Thorne sale did include some leave strips.

We need to protect those more than anything. They were there for a purpose in the past and they're even more important now with private land, mental health, logging going on with almost no restriction. They're not required to do any of the leave strips or buffers or anything.

So those are critical and we need to leave those alone for perhaps 100 years, 80 to 100 years. You start seeing a real forest where they haven't had intervention thinning or anything like that. They do thin themselves naturally and it becomes a viable forest. It looks pretty nice underneath those. Those were small tracks that were done many, many years ago.

I've had the opportunity to walk in some of them that have since been logged again. They were pretty nice. It will turn back into what it was originally, but it takes a long time. My emphasis would be to protect the leave strips that we do have today.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Douville. Anyone else.

Cathy.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had a chance to read this document and I learned a lot actually about habitat management for deer and wolves. The one thing that struck me is that a lot of the recommendations -- well, there were a lot of recommendations essentially in there.

MS. NEEDHAM: Ryan.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Oh, Ryan.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through the Chair. Member Needham. I'll echo what my colleagues at the Forest Service had said. The document is something that I think the three of us and all the folks we work with in those agencies we know that document is out there now and the public is becoming more and more aware of that. This Council is aware of it now.

So it's a tool also. Not only a bagful of recommendations that one size is not going to fit all, but we can go in and identify things that might work in various areas, but also kind of holds our feet to the fire a little bit. It's kind of an accountability for land managers, for the Regional Advisory Council, Board of Game, the Department of Fish and Game.

It's also something that we have to recognize this exists, these are the options and it makes us accountable for staying involved and engaged in decisions that are coming. Not only right now with the LLA, but things that we'll address in the future.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Needham, follow up.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So this Council has expressed in the past the need or the interest in having or understanding Unit 2 wolves and what the potential carrying capacity for wolves are on Prince of Wales Island. I understand that this is a habitat report, so obviously it's not necessarily going to address wolf populations specifically in terms of where do we set management levels according to numbers of wolves what constitutes a healthy population on Prince of Wales.

I'm hoping that that's going to be a next step in the near future that agencies will be working towards giving us the information that we need to know what a healthy population is. How does that way against the priorities or this document with

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 habitat. Are you going to be doing those things 2 independently and actually prioritizing coming up with 3 a number that we can manage for on Prince of Wales 4 Island or are you going to be putting everything into 5 just strictly managing the habitat and the 6 recommendations in this document? 7 8 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member 9 Needham. It's funny when everybody looks at you. You 10 know, through the whole process it was an interesting 11 dynamic to actually separate -- we're talking about 12 habitat management with this report. We didn't want to 13 stray too far into actual wolf management, but they're 14 obviously inexplicably linked. 15 16 You can't have one without the other, 17 but we knew that in the future we wanted to move down 18 the same road as far as identifying a population 19 objective or a harvest objective and to get the input 20 from the community, the hunters and trappers from the 21 Regional Advisory Council, the Forest Service, ADF&G, 22 Fish and Wildlife Service. Those things are, as 23 probably all of us sitting here know, they can be huge 24 endeavors. 25 26 I believe when I spoke to this Council 27 in March I told you I didn't have a date for when we 28 would start that planning process. It takes a little 29 bit of time to get all the players focused in the right 30 direction and moving towards that direction and I feel 31 like we are so much closer to beginning that kind of 32 work than we were even six months ago. 33 34 How our focus will be the Department of 35 Fish and Game's focus in concert with the Forest 36 Service as well as the Council and the communities is 37 to ensure that we have a sustainable population of 38 wolves on Prince of Wales Island. We can't even begin 39 to talk about wolves without talking about deer, which 40 brings us back to habitat management and wolf habitat 41 and all these other things. 42 43 I still don't have a timeline for you, 44 but I can tell you that the Department's focus will be 45 on a sustainable population of wolves while providing 46 for all the various uses of that resource, whether it 47 be trapping, hunting, wildlife viewing, whatever that 48 might be. There will be biological and social and 49 economic and all kinds of factors that will ultimately 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 Service in Yakutat. 2 3 MR. CROSS: This is Rob Cross, 4 subsistence biologist for the Forest Service in Sitka. 5 6 MR. KOLLER: This is Justin Koller, 7 subsistence biologist, Sitka and Hoonah Ranger 8 District. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else. 11 12 (No comments) 13 14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you all for 15 calling in. We're going to be moving on to our 16 wildlife proposals. Just as a reminder to the Council 17 on the back of your name tag there's the procedure for 18 the proposal, how we deal with them. You can use that 19 as a guideline. 20 21 We'll move on to the first proposal 22 WP18-01 on Page 80. Mr. Suminski. 23 24 MR. SUMINSKI: Good afternoon, Council 25 Members. Mr. Chairman. WP18-01 will be introduced by 26 Mr. Jeff Reeves. He's on the phone. Hopefully you'll 27 be able to hear him well. 28 29 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. 30 31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes. 32 33 MR. REEVES: This is Jeff Reeves with 34 the Forest Service. Can you hear me loud and clear? 35 36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes. Go ahead, Jeff. 37 38 MR. REEVES: As you mentioned, the 39 executive summary for the proposal is on Page 80. The 40 analysis begins on Page 83. Proposal WP18-01 was 41 submitted by this Council and it requests that 42 non-Federally qualified users be limited to the harvest 43 of two deer from Federal public lands in Unit 2 and 44 that the season for non-Federally qualified subsistence 45 users be reduced by one week or more. 46 47 The proposal was drafted after hearing 48 testimony during the winter 2017 meeting where 49 subsistence users testified that they had a harder time 50</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 feed into that. 2 3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. 4 5 Mr. Owen. 6 7 MR. OWEN: If I may add to that, Mr. 8 Chair. For Council Members that have not read the 9 document cover to cover, you'll see that over many 10 decades there have been suggestions as to what a wolf 11 population objective should be. I think the key 12 understanding point there is anybody you ask has got an 13 opinion and those opinions vary wildly and that makes 14 it exceptionally difficult for the folks that have to 15 manage the resource for multiple objectives to come up 16 with a solid number. 17 18 I applaud the Department of Fish and 19 Game and the Board of Game for being willing to take 20 that on. At the same time I acknowledge that it's an 21 exceptionally difficult task. 22 23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. I think 24 we'll get to a lot more questions when we get to the 25 wolf proposal. I'm sure there will be a lot more 26 questions and thoughts on population and whatnot. 27 28 I would like to break for lunch until 29 1:45. Thank you. 30 31 MR. OWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 32 33 (Off record) 34 35 (On record) 36 37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Before we get started 38 I'd like to ask anyone on the teleconference again 39 please identify themselves. 40 41 MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara 42 Cellarius with Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and 43 Preserve in Copper Center. 44 45 MR. REEVES: Jeff Reeves, Forest 46 Service in Craig. 47 48 MS. OEHLERS: Good afternoon. This is 49 Susan Oehlers, wildlife biologist for the Forest 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 harvesting deer during the 2016 season. A specific 2 closure date for non-Federally qualified users was not 3 identified through the proposal, but following 4 clarification with the Council chair December 24th was 5 suggested as a starting point to use for the analysis. 6 7 In regards to the adjustment of State 8 seasons and harvest limits, Section 815.3 of ANILCA 9 provides that Federal public lands can be closed to 10 non-subsistence uses when it is necessary to restrict 11 harvest in order to assure the continued viability of a 12 fish or wildlife population or the continuation of 13 subsistence uses of such population. 14 15 It is the Board's view that because it 16 has the authority to close non-subsistence uses under 17 these circumstances, that it could have the authority 18 to take a lesser action, such as limiting the take of 19 fish and wildlife for non-subsistence use. 20 However, the Board has never exercised authority in 21 this manner. 22 23 Seasons and harvest limits for 24 subsistence users in Unit 2 are very liberal. Federal 25 regulations have allowed the harvest of one female deer 26 in the unit since 1995 as well as the harvest of five 27 deer beginning in 2006. Subsistence users are allowed 28 to begin hunting on Federal lands on July 24th and non- 29 qualified users are restricted from hunting the 30 majority of Prince of Wales Island Federal lands during 31 the period of August 1st through August 15th. In the 32 most recent wildlife recycle, subsistence users were 33 given opportunity to hunt Federal lands during the 34 month of January. 35 36 Besides this proposal the Council is 37 also going to be considering Proposal 18-02, which is 38 going to request a change to customary and traditional 39 use determinations for deer in Southeast, which could 40 result in a change of the C&T to all rural residents 41 for the unit. 42 43 If this was approved, the number of 44 qualifying hunters in the unit could increase 45 dramatically, which may be contradicted to the intent 46 of this proposal. There are no direct methods to count 47 deer in Southeast, so the Alaska Department of Fish and 48 Game conducts pellet surveys as an index to the 49 relative abundance of the deer population. 50</p>

Page 86	Page 88
<p>1 It has appeared that populations 2 subsequently have increased after the severe winters of 3 2006 to 2008 and it is felt that since 2010 the Unit 2 4 deer population has been healthy and at a 12-15 year 5 high. 6 7 During fall of 2000 the Alaska Board of 8 Game established a harvest objective of 2,700 deer for 9 the unit. Harvest data is gathered by a statewide 10 harvest report. Estimated deer harvest in the unit 11 between 2005 and 2015 can be found in Figure 2 with 12 harvest by month being found in Table 2. The estimated 13 total annual harvest has averaged 3,467 deer with an 14 average of 100 females during that period. Harvests 15 have been at or above the Unit 2 harvest objectives 16 since 2005. 17 18 Figure 3 shows that Federally qualified 19 subsistence users tend to harvest the most deer in the 20 unit ranging from 55-72 percent of the total harvest 21 during the period. The estimate could be significantly 22 higher as past testimony has suggested that some 23 communities do not fully report harvest taken during 24 the year. 25 26 The average number of deer harvested 27 per hunter has remained stable for Unit 2 residents 28 since 2005 and that can be seen in Figure 4. Figure 5 29 shows the average number of days it's taken to harvest 30 a deer and for Unit 2 residents that number is stable. 31 Currently it's half of what it was during the late 32 1990s. Recent harvest data supports the past pellet 33 group data, suggesting that the deer population in this 34 unit is healthy and stable to increasing. 35 36 Hunters from Unit 2 have had a higher 37 success rate than other hunters with an average success 38 rate of 83 percent during the period with 73 percent of 39 the successful hunters harvesting between 1 to 3 deer 40 as shown in Table 3. Hunters residing in Unit 1A have 41 averaged a 74 percent success rate during the same 42 period and have counted on average only 37.8 percent of 43 the total harvest in Unit 2 as shown in Figure 5. 44 45 Effort by those with other Alaska 46 residents, which would be communities outside of Units 47 1A, 2 or 3, has occurred and has increased from 119 48 hunters in 2005 to 430 during 2014 with effort 49 typically occurring by this group during the rut in 50</p>	<p>1 Staff recommendation is to oppose 2 Proposal WP18-01 as restriction under Section 815 (3) 3 of ANILCA is not necessary at this time for 4 conservation or to meet subsistence needs. Deer 5 harvest in Unit 2 has been on the increase with 6 Federally qualified subsistence users harvesting the 7 majority of the deer in Unit 2. Unit 2 hunters have 8 averaged 2.3 deer per hunter, during the period of 9 2005-2015, which is higher than the 1.9 deer per hunter 10 average for non-Federally qualified users. 11 12 Harvest data also show a decrease in 13 hunt days per deer for Federally qualified subsistence 14 users, which is almost half of the time needed for 15 non-Federally qualified users to harvest a deer. Hunt 16 performance data, as well as deer pellet monitoring, 17 anecdotal accounts and harvest data, suggest the deer 18 population in Unit 2 is currently stable or growing. 19 Harvest data for non-Federally qualified users suggest 20 that the majority of this user group harvests two deer 21 or less per hunter. The data do not support the 22 perception that needs of Federally qualified users are 23 not being met. 24 25 The Unit 2 Federal season currently 26 provides Federally qualified subsistence users the 27 following priorities: eight additional hunting days in 28 July prior to the start of the State season, a closure 29 to non-Federally qualified users for 15 days in August 30 on the majority of the Federal public lands on Prince 31 of 32 Wales Island, a more liberal harvest limit of five 33 deer, opportunity to harvest a female deer after 34 October 15 and 31 additional days in January. Current 35 harvest data suggest these priorities are benefitting 36 Federally qualified subsistence users. A reduction to 37 non-qualified subsistence users is not necessary at 38 this time. 39 40 That concludes my presentation. 41 42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Reeves. 43 Are there any questions by the Council. 44 45 Mr. Hernandez. 46 47 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. 48 Chairman. Jeff, I think one of the things we were 49 hearing in testimony last spring factor in all this is 50</p>
Page 87	Page 89
<p>1 November. It is unknown if this is related to more 2 coverage of Unit 2 from outdoor publications, 3 television shows and word of mouth or if it's related 4 to declines of deer populations in other areas of the 5 state. 6 7 Non-resident activity in the unit has 8 increased from 148 hunters in 2006 to 333 in 2015. 9 This increase may be related to changes in black bear 10 hunting opportunity in the unit. 11 12 Road closures in the unit may have 13 increased numbers of hunters into smaller areas, 14 creating a perception of increasingly crowded hunting 15 conditions. As clear-cuts advance past the early seral 16 stages and deer are less visible from the road, this 17 may also be leading to a misperception of fewer deer. 18 19 Milder weather patterns over the past 20 several years may also be affecting deer hunter 21 success. With less snow at higher elevations later in 22 the season deer may not be concentrated in the lower 23 elevation areas than they have in past years. Another 24 possibility affecting hunter success during the 2016 25 season was what appeared to be an earlier rut in 2016, 26 which peaked during the last week of October, about a 27 week and a half earlier than the typical timing for the 28 unit. 29 30 If adopted, this proposal would reduce 31 the harvest limit and the harvest season for 32 non-Federally qualified users hunting deer on Federal 33 public lands in Unit 2. The proposal would not change 34 the harvest limit under State hunting regulation or 35 affect harvests occurring on State and private lands. 36 37 This proposal could increase harvest 38 opportunity for Federally qualified users hunting deer 39 on Federal public lands in Unit 2. While a reduction in 40 the harvest limit for non-Federally qualified users may 41 make more deer available to harvest, shortening the 42 season in December may not benefit subsistence 43 users as harvest data indicates very few deer are 44 harvested during this time frame by both user groups. 45 46 The proposal would not have any 47 positive effects on deer populations in the unit as 48 deer populations are affected by available habitat and 49 winter weather conditions. 50</p>	<p>1 you've been talking about deer population trends and 2 whatnot, but I think what a lot of people we're seeing 3 was less bucks available. If you want to prefer taking 4 a buck as opposed to taking the one doe we're allowed, 5 you're having a harder time finding bucks. Even though 6 the population may be staying high, we seem to be 7 having trouble finding bucks. 8 9 Is there any kind of information that 10 you have that would kind of relate to what the buck/doe 11 ratio is and what the overall buck population is? 12 13 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr. 14 Hernandez. I don't have any of that type of specific 15 information and perhaps the State could better 16 elaborate on that. My understanding is in the past I 17 think they used to maybe kind of do some pre-season 18 aerial surveys of some alpine and stuff, but I don't 19 know exactly what they looked at. 20 21 I do believe you might be onto 22 something, Mr. Hernandez, because the harvest of does 23 compared to bucks is -- the bucks is pretty high so 24 perhaps that may be having an effect. If it's taking a 25 doe a lot longer to find a buck for breeding and such 26 because they're more spaced out and far lower because 27 of the high harvest. Again, like I said, probably the 28 State might be able to better elaborate on that. 29 30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Reeves. 31 32 Follow up, Don. 33 34 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, one other 35 question on a different topic. Talking about 36 population trends, I notice in the report here that it 37 says there have been no pellet surveys completed for 38 the last three years. I don't know what kind of 39 information you're using for the last three years to 40 kind of determine what the trend has been in that time. 41 42 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr. 43 Hernandez. I actually did realize a couple weeks ago, 44 I actually had to clarify with the State, that that 45 statement is actually an error. There has been some 46 pellet transects done the past few years and I just 47 didn't quite catch that. 48 49 I believe the pellet transects the last 50</p>

Page 90	Page 92
<p>1 few years have been actually okay and I'm sure the 2 State could probably elaborate more on that when they 3 get to the table.</p> <p>4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. We'll reserve 5 those questions for later. Thank you.</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Reeves. 7 Any more questions from the Council.</p> <p>8 (No comments)</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. We'll 10 go on to any consultation with tribes. Mr. Lind, is 11 there any.</p> <p>12 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 Board Members. There was consultation for wildlife 14 proposals for five regions, including Southeast 15 September 14th, and we had the privilege and honor to 16 have Mr. Harvey Kitka present at our conference at the 17 regional office. This could be used for all the 18 proposals that are going to follow. The two things he 19 did recognize was the deer population in decline and 20 also a notice of an increase in bear populations.</p> <p>21 That's all I have.</p> <p>22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do you have any 23 consultation with ANCSA corporations?</p> <p>24 MR. LIND: Negative. We did not.</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Lind. 26 Okay. We'll move on to agency comments. ADF&G.</p> <p>27 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 28 We actually have a PowerPoint presentation on this 29 proposal and we got some late data yesterday that we 30 needed to do some cleanup on. DeAnna has been hounding 31 me to get them all to her. We just didn't get this in 32 one. If we could hold for just a minute to get that up 33 there. Thank you, sir.</p> <p>34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: For those people that 35 are listening in on the teleconference, we will get to 36 public testimony and give everyone a chance to comment 37 if they choose.</p>	<p>1 There's a mandatory reporting 2 requirement on those harvest tickets so we know how 3 many people from each community reported. Despite the 4 fact of the mandatory reporting requirement, not 5 everyone reports, so we need to expand our data to 6 account for the people who did not report.</p> <p>7 We do that by looking at the data that 8 people who did report turned in and simply do a 9 proportional expansion. Assuming that the people who 10 did not report did the same thing as the people who did 11 report. We have no other way to do it. So the final 12 numbers you'll see in this presentation represent 13 information people actually reported and then the 14 expanded data added to that.</p> <p>15 Harvest is the main thing people wonder 16 about. This graph shows harvest for the last 20 years 17 by Federally qualified users in Unit 2 and non- 18 Federally qualified users. I think the broad trend to 19 keep an eye on here is that harvest in the last 20 20 years has consistently gone up. It's been fairly 21 stable for the last 8 or 10 years. And it's gone up 22 for both Federally qualified users and non-Federally 23 qualified users. We did see a decline in harvest in 24 2016. I would point out that even though harvest 25 declined in 2016 it's still very high and 2015 was an 26 all-time record. So harvest is well within the 10-year 27 average and still very high.</p> <p>28 Number of hunters I think I've heard in 29 meetings on Prince of Wales Island that we're seeing a 30 lot more non-Federally qualified users here. I think 31 that may have been the inspiration for the proposal. 32 The information we have says yes. There are more non- 33 Federally qualified hunters hunting in Unit 2 now than 34 there were 10 years ago. There's a clear upward trend 35 in that red line. The number of Federally qualified 36 users has gone up a little bit, but not nearly as much. 37 So, yes, that is a real trend.</p> <p>38 Now not only the numbers of hunters 39 affect harvest but it's also the effort. You can see 40 that effort generally mirrors the number of hunters. 41 It's gone up steadily for the last 10 years, much more 42 so for non-resident hunters or non-Federally qualified 43 hunters than it has for Federally qualified hunters.</p> <p>44 If we look at the effort information in</p>
Page 91	Page 93
<p>1 Thank you.</p> <p>2 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 Just prior to beginning the State's comments I wanted 4 to introduce Tom Schumacher, our management 5 coordinator. He'll be leading this proposal discussion 6 for the State. Boyd Porter, the Unit 1A, Unit 2 7 Ketchikan POW area biologist. Also joining us is 8 Stephanie Sell, the Juneau area biologist. We'll have 9 Rich Lowell and Steve Bethune available over the phone 10 as we work our way through the proposals.</p> <p>11 MR. SCHUMACHER: Council Members, thank 12 you for having me. I'm here to present the State's 13 comments on Proposal 18-01, the Unit 2 deer proposal.</p> <p>14 I thought I'd start out talking about 15 the question we're really asking here and then move 16 into what kind of information the State can provide to 17 help you answer that question. The question I came up 18 with is do non-Federally qualified hunters inhibit 19 Federally qualified deer hunters from meeting their 20 subsistence needs.</p> <p>21 We're here to provide information for 22 you to use in your deliberations on the proposal. The 23 types of information we have are deer population trend 24 data and deer hunter and harvest data. There was just a 25 question about deer population data. Deer are very, 26 very difficult to census or detect trends and 27 populations except for very large changes.</p> <p>28 We do have deer pellet information that 29 we do every year, but those pellet transect surveys are 30 not sensitive to small changes in deer populations. 31 They're designed to detect large changes primarily over 32 longer periods of time than year-to-year changes. So 33 really the best information we had to inform this 34 discussion is the hunter effort and harvest data we get 35 from harvest ticket reports.</p> <p>36 Before I talk about that I wanted to go 37 into how the Department collects that data and how we 38 estimate total harvest and total effort and things like 39 that. Everyone here who hunts deer knows that before 40 you go you have to get your harvest tickets so we know 41 how many people in each community have gotten harvest 42 tickets.</p>	<p>1 terms of hunter efficiency, are people having to spend 2 more time in the woods looking for a deer than they 3 have in the past. I think Member Hernandez asked about 4 difficulty finding bucks and people spending extra time 5 out hunting. The information that we have shows that 6 the days of effort required to find a deer to harvest 7 have been essentially stable for the last 10 years for 8 Federally qualified users whereas it has increased a 9 good deal for non-Federally qualified users.</p> <p>10 So the key points from the harvest 11 information that we have is that although the harvest 12 declined it remains high. This is for Federally 13 qualified users. The number of an effort by 14 non-Federally qualified hunters has increased over the 15 last 10 years. That's a real trend. So if you're 16 seeing that, that's real. And then effort required for 17 Federally qualified hunters to harvest a deer has 18 changed very little in the last 10 years. So based on 19 that information trend, to us it doesn't look like 20 people are having a harder time finding a deer to 21 harvest.</p> <p>22 There may be public testimony that we 23 heard on Prince of Wales Island and you may have heard 24 here today that leads you to think that doesn't reflect 25 the experience of other people, people who hunt on the 26 island, but the information I've presented to you is 27 the only source of deer hunter information we have and 28 it's the most unbiased source too. It's information 29 reported to us by hunters.</p> <p>30 However, the reporting rate is 31 something I'd like to talk about because that can 32 reflect the certainty around the information we 33 present. I'm afraid some of those numbers came out a 34 little bit small for people in the back to read, but 35 essentially what this list is is seven communities that 36 are Federally qualified to hunt in Unit 2. So Coffman 37 Cove, Craig, Hydaburg, Klawock, Petersburg, Thorne Bay 38 and Wrangell. The two largest groups of non-Federally 39 qualified hunters, which are hunters from Ketchikan and 40 non-resident hunters.</p> <p>41 The statewide average reporting rate 42 for 2016 was about 69 percent of hunters who got deer 43 harvest tickets actually reported. A number of 44 communities that are Federally qualified in Unit 2, 45 Petersburg, Thorne Bay, Wrangell, they had reporting</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 rates that were about that high. Non-resident hunters 2 reported about that rate. A number of other 3 communities on Prince of Wales reported at much lower 4 rates. Coffman Cove is about 50 percent, Craig is 5 about 45, Hydaburg is about 30, Klawock is about 35. 6 7 When we get low rates of reporting, 8 that doesn't mean our expanded harvest data is wrong, 9 but it means there's a lot more uncertainty about 10 whether it's right. You can look at this and say 11 Ketchikan, they only reported 50 percent and that's 12 true. That could improve too. 13 14 Ketchikan had 950 people report. When 15 you have a big number of people like that report, you 16 tend to catch the variation in the data and you have a 17 little more certainty that when you expand that data 18 it's going to reflect what that community did. When 19 you only have 25, 30, 40 percent of the people report, 20 there's less certainty about the data. 21 22 So if what we presented here today 23 doesn't reflect what your community members tell you or 24 what you've experienced yourself, all I can say is 25 encourage them to report complete and accurate data. 26 27 We've questioned the accuracy of the 28 data for some of these too. We just don't know. So we 29 were fishing around for another source of data. 30 Something else to compare what hunter reports tell us, 31 to corroborate that or give us another view of it. 32 Some of you have been around for a while, probably 33 participated in this survey. 34 35 In 1997 the Alaska Department of Fish 36 and Game's Subsistence Division did an in-person 37 household survey of three communities on Prince of 38 Wales Island. They hired a local community member to 39 go around to selected households to conduct the survey 40 with people in their homes. They shot for about a 41 third of the community and you can see how many 42 households in each community were surveyed. 43 44 They asked about a variety of 45 subsistence activities including deer hunting. The 46 first column shows the number of households that were 47 surveyed in each community; 51 in Hydaburg, 173 in 48 Craig, 106 in Klawock. The second column shows the 49 numbers of deer those households reported harvesting in 50</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 part. 2 3 4 Last year harvest for both groups of 5 hunters declined, but the effort and the number of non- 6 Federally qualified hunters also declined. If 7 competition from non-Federally qualified hunters 8 declined, are they causing -- are they inhibiting? 9 That seems inconsistent. It's also important to keep 10 in mind that one year of data doesn't mean it's a trend 11 and that harvest remains very high. 12 13 Finally, there is evidence of actual 14 harvest by some Federally qualified communities may be 15 far higher than what we get from our hunt reports. So 16 based on that information the Department doesn't see 17 any need to restrict non-Federally qualified hunters. 18 There doesn't appear to be any inhibition of Federally 19 qualified users, so we'd oppose this proposal. 20 21 With that I'd be happy to take any 22 questions. 23 24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any questions from the 25 Council. 26 27 Mr. Reifensstuhl. 28 29 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Yes, thank you. I've 30 got a couple questions. One I'd like to comment on 31 this anecdotal comments earlier about sex ratio. So if 32 you could comment if there's any research on that. And 33 then in the reporting don't you think there's a bias of 34 people that don't harvest a deer they tend not to turn 35 in a report? So I would think if that's true, that 36 would be my hypothesis, then that would bias your 37 results. 38 39 MR. SCHUMACHER: That is possible but 40 we don't know what people who don't report do. We do 41 go back and send reminders out and we can look at the 42 data that those people turn in and that may be one way 43 of looking at whether there is some kind of bias in 44 that way. That's something that we do have on our 45 to-do list, but we haven't gotten around to that yet. 46 So that's something to investigate. 47 48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: A follow up? 49 50 MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, there was a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 that year. 2 3 4 So the 51 households in Hydaburg 5 reported harvesting 175 deer, 173 households in Craig 6 reported harvesting 963 deer and the 106 households in 7 Klawock reported harvesting 503 deer. The middle 8 column is merely that number of deer expanded to 9 account for 100 percent of households in that 10 community. So for Hydaburg that's 449 deer, Craig 11 2,889 and Klawock 1,437. 12 13 The next column over is the first year 14 of data from the Department's old mail-out deer hunter 15 survey. 1997 was the first year that we did a mail-out 16 survey for deer hunters. The surveys were sent to 17 about a third of households. Some people completed 18 them and mailed them back and that's the data that we 19 got out of them. That's the expanded harvest data for 20 those communities from the deer hunter survey. 21 22 I think you'll see that there is quite 23 a difference between our estimate from the deer hunter 24 survey and the expanded estimate from the household 25 survey. It's generally an order of magnitude or about 26 10 times greater for the household survey. The final 27 column in the right is 2016's expanded harvest data 28 from our now mandatory harvest reports. You can see 29 they've gone up for all communities. They're still 30 nowhere near the estimated harvest from the household 31 surveys. 32 33 So one conclusion you can draw from 34 that is are the Department's harvest survey data may 35 greatly underestimate the harvest in some Unit 2 36 communities. What does that mean? Well, we saw this 37 graph earlier. It's the number of deer harvested. That 38 green line on the top is Federally qualified harvest. 39 Depending on how much weight you might give to the 40 household survey data, that green line could be way 41 higher than that. 42 43 So that's the information we have on 44 harvest. Where does that leave us. The original 45 question I posed was do non-Federally qualified hunters 46 inhibit the Federally qualified hunters from harvesting 47 their subsistence needs from deer. I think the Forest 48 Service covered the season and that Federally qualified 49 hunters have about 53 days of exclusive hunting on the 50 island except for that small area in the Southeast</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p> <p>1 second part. 2 3 4 MR. SCHUMACHER: Excuse me. What was 5 the second part. 6 7 MR. HERNANDEZ: About the sex ratio. 8 9 MR. SCHUMACHER: Oh, that's right. We 10 don't have any information on sex ratio. At the moment 11 all we're doing on Prince of Wales for population 12 surveys are pellet group transects. We're also doing 13 some aerial surveys on the northern part of the island 14 and I don't have that information with me because at 15 this point we're really not sure what the aerial survey 16 data means. We're going to be undertaking some 17 research to look at what that tells us in the near 18 future. 19 20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Porter. 21 22 MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. 23 Members of the Council, I'll take a shot at the sex 24 ratio question. For the record, my name is Boyd 25 Porter. We did get an incidental measure of sex ratio 26 when we were doing all the deer pellet mark/recapture 27 estimates through Todd Brinkman's work. That work 28 showed about a 50/50 sex ratio at least during the work 29 in three different watershed on Prince of Wales. 30 31 Then also during the fawn mortality 32 work that Sophie Gilbert did none of the collared 33 does/captured does that did not become pregnant by the 34 end of the second estrus. So, to us, that was some 35 measure that there were sufficient numbers of bucks in 36 the population to do the breeding. 37 38 In places in whitetail populations 39 where they have deer yarding and opportunities to 40 observe deer, they can do that sex ratio pretty easily. 41 With these Sitka black-tailed deer you can't do it. 42 43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: If you're on the 44 teleconference, please mute your phone unless you have 45 something to add. 46 47 Thank you. Any other questions. 48 49 Mr. Howard. 50</p>

1 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. How
2 do you determine whether or not a nonrural hunter
3 inhibits a rural hunter? Being a rural hunter, I kind
4 of have an idea that they do and I can explain to you
5 how they do, but I want to hear how you came to the
6 conclusion that they don't.

7 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
8 Member Howard. We only know the data that hunters
9 report to us, so I'm only interpreting hunt report
10 data. That data shows that rural resident hunter
11 effort for deer is essentially flat, so the amount of
12 effort required to harvest a deer has not increased in
13 10 years. The harvest is generally high.

14 If the time it takes you to find a deer
15 and the number of deer you find are about the same for
16 the last 10 years, during that period of increase for
17 non-Federally qualified hunters, it seems like there
18 isn't any evidence in the data we have to support the
19 idea they're inhibiting the hunters. Your experience
20 may be different, but it's not reflected in our data.

21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Do you
22 have a follow up, Mr. Howard.

23 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 The reason I asked the question is at home -- I've been
25 hunting since I was a little kid with my dad, so we
26 have these certain areas. There's reasons for
27 everything we do and why we go where we go when we go
28 there.

29 The point I'm getting to is I'll go to
30 a spot and there's a nonrural hunter there for some
31 haphazard reason. So when I go there to feed my
32 family, he's there already, so he's inhibiting my
33 ability to take care of my family. So that doesn't
34 show up anywhere in your data.

35 Mr. Wagner was here earlier talking
36 about local knowledge. I used to serve on the Native
37 American Fish and Wildlife Committee and what I've
38 learned was eventually when the State no longer can
39 manage the resource because there was no resource left
40 to manage was the State gave the resource management
41 over to the tribes.

42 I can give you an instance where on the

1 Columbia River the sockeye were depleted down to where
2 they thought they were going to be extinct. The tribe
3 took it over and brought it from 400 to 5,000 returning
4 back up to the Columbia River. So I'd like to see
5 traditional knowledge or local knowledge even
6 implemented into your process before there's no
7 resource left.

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

10 Mr. Douville and then Mr. Hernandez.

11 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman.
12 We've been harvesting about 4,000 bucks a year and yet
13 your data is showing that the buck/doe ratio is at
14 50/50. It just doesn't make any sense to me because
15 everybody I'm talking to says we're having a hard time
16 finding bucks. We're seeing a few deer, but I think
17 something is not making sense to me even a little bit.

18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

19 Mr. Hernandez.

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
21 Chairman. I guess I'm having a hard time trying to
22 square in what we hear as public testimony and what we
23 hear from our neighbors about the hunting situation
24 with the information that you get through your hunter
25 surveys. I know it's just not working as well as it
26 can and I'm trying to figure out why that is.

27 I think Mr. Reifensuhl brought up a
28 very good point as a possibility. Just the way people
29 report. Another factor is I know that the way your
30 surveys are kind of presented in a very short form,
31 basically how many trips did you make and what did you
32 harvest on that trip, which works great for somebody
33 who's spending one week a year coming over to Prince of
34 Wales and they can very easily say I hunted four days,
35 I got one deer.

36 That really doesn't work very well for
37 local people who are literally out almost every day,
38 kind of driving around. They're getting firewood,
39 they're doing whatever they're doing and they're
40 stopping and they're checking out deer hunting spots.

1 They're spending day after day after day and there's
2 really no way to easily kind of reflect that on your
3 hunter report forms.

4 I don't know if that's something that
5 you've considered, just the difference in hunting
6 patterns between a rural resident and a nonrural
7 resident. Have you discussed this? Has it been
8 something that you've tried to work on at all? I don't
9 know.

10 MR. SCHUMACHER: The answer is, yes, we
11 have thought about that and discussed that and it's an
12 issue elsewhere too. We haven't come up with a good
13 way of addressing it, but that is something that's
14 again on our radar.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, the issue before
16 us is not necessarily how many deer are out there.
17 It's kind of how much time and effort people are
18 putting into getting a deer. Like Mr. Reifensuhl
19 pointed out, people that don't have success might not
20 report. There's just a whole bunch of factors. The
21 situation we're trying to resolve is not a deer
22 population problem. It is a competition problem and
23 how do you try and gauge that in some way and what are
24 the factors and how to resolve it. It's really
25 difficult. I know this was our best effort here,
26 reducing the bag limit. I don't know. We'll discuss
27 it more in deliberations, I guess.

28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
29 Hernandez. Is there anyone else that has a question.

30 Mr. Schroeder.

31 MR. SCHROEDER: Well, I guess it seems
32 like it's Groundhog Day all over again here with deer
33 numbers on Prince of Wales. I had the opportunity to
34 work on Prince of Wales and try to get deer harvest
35 estimates. Household surveys work, but they're really
36 expensive and they're very hard to do to justify doing
37 every year unless you really say you have to have that
38 data that is vital for management.

39 As it is, I appreciate you presented
40 the slide that showed the comparisons. From just an
41 analytical point of view you have to say, whoa, I just
42 don't know what's going on in Hydraburg, Craig and

1 Klawock. You'd have to say, well, I know they're
2 hunting deer, but I have no confidence that the data
3 show an increase or a decrease or it's the same because
4 the really low level of reporting along with the
5 discrepancy between the harvest ticket report data and
6 the few times that there has been household surveys you
7 have to say we just don't know what's going on.

8 Then that makes our job really
9 difficult because in the absence of that data the
10 tendency would be to rely on public testimony and rely
11 on what people are telling us and saying, gosh, we're
12 having really a lot of trouble getting deer. So it
13 kind of pushes in that direction.

14 I guess I'm rambling a little bit.
15 There may be other ways of improving data collection if
16 it's something that becomes a priority. It's worked
17 effectively in some communities to have tribes and
18 communities participate fully in data gathering, which
19 turns out to be way less expensive than having a survey
20 crew go out every once in a while.

21 But we're kind of in a tough position
22 here because we're not quite sure what's going on with
23 the deer population, but that seems maybe it's okay.
24 But we definitely don't know what's going on with
25 hunters in these communities based on any quantitative
26 data. I guess there's no real answer to that.

27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
28 Schroeder. Any other questions.

29 Mr. Scott.

30 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
31 Through the Chair, Member Schroeder and Member
32 Hernandez as well. The debate that you're having right
33 now is something that we debate almost annually about
34 deer harvest data. It's a constant dynamic in how to
35 improve the data collection and to bring it to you and
36 to the Board of Game and others.

37 For instance, the reason we didn't have
38 this ready to go was we got some new data and we're
39 working on that to bring you the latest. I would
40 emphasize a point that Mr. Schumacher made that it's
41 the only data that we have at this point and I can
42 appreciate for sure what Member Howard injected, was

Page 102	Page 104
<p>1 using local knowledge and utilizing that and that's a 2 question that's come up with other species that we've 3 discussed. 4 5 So this is a very dynamic thing almost 6 that's constantly evolving. So Mr. Hernandez's 7 comments about how to capture data for someone who is 8 essentially hunting deer day in, day out while they're 9 out doing things. We would welcome suggestions on that 10 as well. If there are ideas of how to change things 11 and capture that more accurately, please let us know on 12 any of those. 13 14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ryan. I 15 have a question about a component that hasn't been 16 mentioned too much. I saw it in one of your slides, is 17 the nonresident component. It seemed like it's really 18 high, almost as much as the hunters on the island. Is 19 that a growing trend for nonresident hunters? 20 21 MR. SCHUMACHER: I did not break the 22 data out by just nonresidents. The one slide showing 23 reporting rate for nonresidents, but everything else I 24 just lumped into Federally qualified and non-Federally 25 qualified. So off the top of my head I couldn't tell 26 you what that is, but we can figure that out. 27 28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah, it seems like 29 there's more and more advertising for guided hunts for 30 Sitka black-tail and I just wondered if that's a 31 growing thing. It appears to be more popular than 32 other growing things in the state, but typical of 33 people wanting to come and do something in Alaska. 34 35 Another question is what's the 36 population trend for deer around the Ketchikan area? 37 38 MR. SCHUMACHER: I'll defer to our 39 Ketchikan area biologist for that one. 40 41 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, The trend 42 is increasing with these mild winters almost everywhere 43 in Southern Southeast you're seeing increases in deer 44 populations. Consequently harvest is going up. You 45 can see it in that trajectory on the reported harvest. 46 47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any other 48 questions. Thank you very much. Are there any Federal 49 agencies that have any reports or comments for us. 50</p>	<p>1 Another factor is in 2016 the United 2 States Forest Service released numbers about the wolf 3 population showing very high levels of increasing 4 population and a higher density of wolves in the area 5 in Unit 2. 6 7 So those are the reasons the 8 resolutions Craig Tribal Association has put in front 9 of you to the resolution is a 2017-41 asking the RAC 10 Council to help the rural users be able to subsist on 11 their deer. I believe traditional knowledge is a very 12 good way of getting it. I'm speaking for our members 13 in Craig. I'm the tribal president, so I speak for the 14 members and this is what I'm hearing. 15 16 Everywhere we go there's nonrural 17 people on the roads and they're using our areas and 18 even on the water now. The deer hunting is popular on 19 the island during the rut. You get large numbers of 20 people on boats traveling to Unit 2 and hunting deer. 21 22 So those are some of the trends we're 23 seeing and I thank you for your time and I hope this 24 knowledge we have helps you. 25 26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Cook. 27 We have three resolutions from local tribes on Prince 28 of Wales in front of you. There was a handout put out 29 to you. I'd like to ask Ms. Perry to address those for 30 us, please. 31 32 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 33 Would you like me to read each resolution into the 34 record? 35 36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is everybody good with 37 that, have them read into the record? 38 39 (Council nodding) 40 41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah. Thank you. 42 43 MS. PERRY: The first comment we 44 received from Craig Tribal Association is titled CTA 45 Resolution 2017-41. Title: A resolution from the 46 Craig Tribal Association, a Federally recognized tribe. 47 A request to reduce the deer harvest level in Game Unit 48 2 with the requirement for nonrural hunters to use tags 49 1 and 2 in Game Unit 2. 50</p>
Page 103	Page 105
<p>1 (No comments) 2 3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any tribal entities. 4 5 MR. COOK: Yes, I have a comment. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Go ahead. State your 8 name for the record, please. 9 10 MR. COOK: My name is Clinton Cook. 11 I'm the tribal president at the Craig Tribal 12 Association in Craig, Alaska, Federally recognized 13 tribe. I'd like to thank the Council for listening 14 today and the Chair for recognizing me. 15 16 I've been listening to this since Jeff 17 started and I'm just going to start off by saying the 18 Forest Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and 19 Game seem to be very inconclusive on deer numbers and 20 who's taking deer. As you all can see in front of you, 21 three tribes on the island have united to try to help 22 us obtain our harvest levels. I believe Mr. Hernandez 23 spoke about traditional knowledge. There's no better 24 way of getting knowledge based on the people who 25 survive and what we do. 26 27 There's some main reasons the tribe has 28 put together as to why we're not able to harvest our 29 deer. They did allow us to hunt in early July through 30 August. Well, most of those times we're harvesting 31 other species of salmon to put in our cupboards and 32 that time of year it's very hot and most people won't 33 harvest an animal and let it waste because of the time 34 of the year. 35 36 Another problem is the Forest Service 37 road closures that are happening on Prince of Wales, 38 which in turn, when we go to those areas to hunt, 39 they're already taken by nonrural people who spend a 40 week over here hunting. That affects our way of life 41 drastically. 42 43 Another reason is daily foot traffic, 44 daily vehicle traffic on the Inter-island Ferry 45 Authority. People can come and go as they please, 46 which is fine, but when they're competing with us as 47 rural users, it hurts our rural status and harvesting 48 animals for us to feed our families on. 49 50</p>	<p>1 Whereas the Craig Tribal Association 2 (CTA) is a duly constituted Indian tribe organized 3 pursuant to the authority of Section 16 of the Act of 4 Congress on June 18, 1934, 48 Stat. 984, as amended by 5 the Acts of Congress June 15, 1934, 49 Stat. 378, and 6 May 1st, 1936, 49 Stat. 1250; and 7 8 Whereas the Craig Tribal Association 9 Tribal Council is the governing body of the Craig Tribe 10 in accordance with the Constitution and bylaws 11 representing the Association and all its undertakings 12 for the well-being of the Tribe, exercising their 13 powers and authority to make rules and regulations; and 14 15 Whereas the Craig Tribal Association, a 16 Federally recognized tribe on behalf of its tribal 17 citizens, is concerned about the ability of the Alaska 18 Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) to monitor the 19 traffic on the Inter-island Ferry Authority (Ferry), 20 the number of deer harvested and removed from Prince of 21 Wales Game Unit 2 by Ferry is not adequately 22 documented; and 23 24 Whereas the Craig Tribal Association is 25 proposing to reduce the number of deer harvested in 26 Unit 2 by requiring nonrural hunters to use tags 1 and 27 2 while participating in a deer harvest in Game Unit 2; 28 and 29 30 Whereas the Craig Tribal Association is 31 supporting the reduction of the number of deer 32 harvested by nonrural resident hunters in Game Unit 2 33 from four deer to two deer. 34 35 That is the end of CTA Resolution 2017- 36 41. I'm sorry, there is one last paragraph. Now 37 therefore be it resolved the Craig Tribal Association, 38 a Federally recognized tribe in Craig, Alaska requests 39 the Southeast Regional Advisory Council implement 40 action to reduce the deer harvest for non-residents 41 from four deer to two deer with a requirement to use 42 tags 1 and 2 in Game Unit 2. 43 44 There's a certification. Approved, 45 passed and adopted by a duly-constituted quorum of the 46 Craig Tribal Association tribal council on this 30th 47 day of October, 2017. Six yes, zero no, zero abstain, 48 zero absent, zero excused. This was signed by Clinton 49 E. Cook, Sr., Tribal President. That is the end of the 50</p>

Page 106

CTA Resolution 2017-41.

The next comment received as a resolution is from the Organized Village of Kasaan. This is Resolution OVK 17-10-003. A resolution of the Organized Village of Kasaan requesting the Southeast Regional Advisory Council reduce the deer harvest level in Game Unit 2 for nonrural hunters from four deer to two deer and with the requirement to use tags 1 and 2.

Whereas the Organized Village of Kasaan is a Federally recognized tribe organized pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, 48 Stat. 984 and May 1st, 1936, 49 Stat. 1250; and

Whereas the corporate charter of the Organized Village of Kasaan ratified October 15th, 1938 states in its purpose and existence, "In order to further the economic development of the Indians residing in the neighborhood of Kasaan, Alaska by conferring upon the Organized Village of Kasaan corporate rights and powers and to enable this village and its members to undertake enterprises designed to secure for the members of a corporation and assure economic independence."; and

Whereas the Organized Village of Kasaan, hereinafter OVK, is governed by a council of elected representatives composed of a president and six members who acted in accordance with the powers granted to it by its constitution and bylaws, ratified on October 15, 1938; and

Whereas the OVK Tribal Council on behalf of its tribal citizens is concerned about the ability of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) to monitor the traffic on the Inter-island Ferry Authority (Ferry), the number of deer harvested and removed from Prince of Wales Game Unit 2 by Ferry is not adequately documented; and

Whereas the OVK is proposing to reduce the number of deer harvested in Unit 2 by requiring nonrural hunters to use tags 1 and 2 while participating in a deer harvest in Game Unit 2; and

Whereas the OVK is supporting the reduction of the number of deer harvested by nonrural resident hunters in Game Unit 2 from four deer to two

Page 108

Be it further resolved that a majority of the nine KCA Council members whose signatures appear next to their name will constitute the approval of this resolution. This resolution has been signed by Patricia Rowan, vice-president; A. Webster Demmert, III; James Williams; Donald Nickerson, Jr.; Eva Rowan. That is the end of Klawock Cooperative Association Resolution No. 17-17.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms. Perry. Are there any other tribal entities that wish to comment on this proposal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are there any comments from any other Regional Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committees or Subsistence Resource Commissions.

Ms. Perry.

MS. PERRY: We have received no comments from these advisory groups.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there a summary of written public comments.

MS. PERRY: Yes. Thank you, Chair. For the record, this is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator. The public comments on Wildlife Proposal 18-01 begins on Page 99 of the meeting book.

A summary of written public comments is as follows: Two written comments were received. One was a general public comment from Curtis Donald Thomas of Ketchikan addressing all Southeast proposals. Key viewpoints were that attempts were being made to fix a problem that does not exist and he expressed concerns regarding new classes of citizens with special hunting rights being created, residency criteria and the ability of some Alaskans to harvest 20 halibut a day.

The other comment in support was from Barnett Freedman of Thorne Bay, Prince of Wales Island.

Page 107

deer; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the council of the Organized Village of Kasaan that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council implement action to reduce the deer harvest for non-rural resident hunters from four deer to two deer with a requirement to use tags 1 and 2 in Game Unit 2.

There is a certification. Approved, passed and adopted by a duly-constituted quorum of the OVK Tribal Council on this 30th day of October, 2017 by a telephone poll. Della Coburn, yes; Audrey Escoffon, yes; Glenn Hamar, yes; Ronald Leighton, yes; Carrie Sykes, yes. This was signed by Frederick Olsen, Jr., president. That is the end of the resolution OVK 17-10-003.

The last resolution we received was from the Klawock Cooperative Association Tribe. It is Resolution No. 17-17. Title: A request to reduce the deer harvest level in Game Unit 2 with the requirement for nonrural hunters to use tags 1 and 2 in Game Unit 2.

Whereas the Klawock Cooperative Association (KCA) is concerned about the ability of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to adequately monitor and document the number of deer harvested and removed from Game Unit 2 and shipped off of Prince of Wales Island via the traffic on the Inter-island Ferry Authority (Ferry); and

Whereas KCA is proposing to reduce the number of deer harvested in Unit 2 by requiring nonrural hunters to use tags 1 and 2 while participating in a deer harvest in Game Unit 2; and

Whereas KCA is supporting the reduction of the number of deer harvested by nonrural resident hunters in Game Unit 2 from four deer to two deer; now, therefore, it is

Resolved, that Klawock Cooperative Association Tribal Council hereby requests the Southeast Regional Advisory Council implement action to reduce the deer harvest for non-residents from four deer to two deer with a requirement to use tags 1 and 2 in Game Unit 2.

Page 109

Key viewpoints included a reduction of harvest as needed as competition from outside hunters continues to be an issue and a doe season does not make sense for the health of the herd.

Those were the only written public comments received, Chair.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms. Perry. We don't have any public comments in the house. Is there any public comments from anyone on the teleconference.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. We'll move on to -- what's the will of the Council. Entertain a motion to adopt.

Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair. I move to adopt WP18-01.

MR. YEAGER: Second.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved by Mr. Kitka and seconded by Mr. Yeager. Discussion.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you. Even though it didn't say their needs are not being met, the words say that their needs are not being met. This is one of the bases of this Council. Once needs are not being met something must be done.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka. Anyone else.

Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: I have a concern that the overall analysis, the proposal that was submitted asked for both the reduction in harvest level and it also requested that the season for non-Federally qualified subsistence users be reduced by one week or

Page 110

1 more. I don't seem to see that that second part of the
2 proposal has been addressed. Am I missing something
3 here or is that just left out? I don't know if we want
4 to call staff up for that or not.

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: You're right, I think
6 it was overlooked. I think we need to clarify whether
7 we need more.....

8 MR. SCHROEDER: Let's get staff on the
9 record concerning that, please.

10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
11 Schroeder.

12 MR. SCHROEDER: Terry perhaps.

13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Suminski. Jeff,
14 are you still online?

15 MR. REEVES: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am.
16 Mr. Chairman, Mr. Schroeder. The information that I
17 received when I did my initial data request was able to
18 get harvest by month, but it didn't really have a
19 breakdown by the user groups. Now at the time I got
20 that I didn't delve deeper into it and maybe the State
21 could further elaborate if that type of harvest
22 information is available.

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Schroeder.

24 MR. SCHROEDER: Jeff, it's not really a
25 question about the data that was presented. It's a
26 question about the analysis because the Council should
27 be considering the full proposal, which has two
28 components to it. One is the component to reduce the
29 deer harvest to two. The second is to reduce the
30 non-Federally qualified season by one week or more.

31 As you know, those two things could be
32 treated quite differently by the Federal Subsistence
33 Board. The Federal Subsistence Board doesn't have a
34 precedent for reducing bag limits, but it does have a
35 precedent for closing areas. So when we get further on
36 in the discussion it may be that the Council considers
37 those two issues separately.

38 Was there some reason why you did not
39 provide an analysis for the season reduction, Jeff?

40

Page 111

1 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
2 Schroeder. I thought I did have that. The analysis,
3 as I mentioned at the very beginning, just tried to use
4 December 24th as a starting date. So when I looked at
5 the harvest by month, even when it's just a
6 conglomerate of all user groups, harvest in December is
7 so little.

8 So the recommendation at least of this
9 proposal was to oppose and it was looking at it, I
10 guess, at that level, but I believe the Council has the
11 ability that if they believe that something in this
12 proposal that date could be even further limited, then
13 I believe that's the Council's prerogative to push
14 that.

15 Like I said earlier though, to try to
16 sit there and get the harvest by month by all the user
17 groups, I did not receive that data, so perhaps I did
18 not look at it as deeply as maybe I could have, but as
19 you'll see though in Table 3 the monthly harvest, at
20 least looking at December, it's so low that it may not
21 make a difference and that was brought out in the
22 justification.

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: So, in other words, we
24 don't have an analysis for that portion of the
25 proposal.

26 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. And that's
27 the other part too with the State's data. To look at
28 say just the date of December 24th to the end of the
29 season, the data didn't break down the specific harvest
30 date because when it is reported on the harvest report,
31 it's only a month of harvest that gets reported. It's
32 not month and date. So you really can't get real fine
33 in the data.

34 So even say something like in August a
35 portion of harvest that might be occurring before
36 August 16th when non-Federally qualified can start
37 hunting Prince of Wales, it doesn't get down to that
38 detail.

39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

40 Council.

41 Mr. Reifensstuhl.

42

Page 112

1 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Thank you. I would
2 agree that the data could be better, more information,
3 but that's always the case in these kind of discussions
4 and decisions. I mean the only way to get complete
5 data is like you do in fisheries and then hunting,
6 harvesting off terrestrial areas, it's much more
7 difficult to do that. So we need to rely on the best
8 information available.

9 One thing I'd point out is that
10 although imperfect the information collected through
11 the years, through the decades, has been very similar.
12 So the trend lines are probably more reliable rather
13 than the actual precision of the estimate they're
14 giving us.

15 So based on that, I don't think there's
16 a conservation concern. I also note that non-Federally
17 qualified are terrible hunters because they harvest
18 many less animals per unit of effort they provide. So,
19 again, I don't see a conservation concern and I don't
20 believe this is going to help with actual subsistence
21 other than if you don't like seeing non-Federally
22 qualified out there, you may see less people.

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Steve.
24 Anyone else.

25 Mr. Hernandez.

26 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
27 Chairman. I'm intending to vote in favor of this
28 proposal. I think the main issue before us is the
29 subsistence priority and whether or not rural residents
30 do have a priority use for the deer in this unit.

31 A number of years ago when we did
32 undertake this Unit 2 Deer Working Group and we went
33 through all of these discussions previously and at that
34 time we did come to the conclusion that there should be
35 a priority for subsistence users and the way we went
36 about doing that was we gave the earlier season, we
37 extended the season later into January and we opened up
38 -- like I say, that earlier season was a 20-day early
39 start and we have allowed an extra buck over the time,
40 raised the subsistence take from four deer to five
41 deer. So we took those efforts to create that
42 subsistence priority.

43

Page 113

1 So I guess one of the questions in my
2 mind was have those actions been adequate to achieve
3 that goal and I think what we're hearing from public
4 testimony is not necessarily so. That maybe we need a
5 little further action to kind of assure that the
6 subsistence priority is being met, which we've already
7 decided was a worthwhile goal for Unit 2.

8 I think what we're kind of hearing here
9 today is that maybe some of the inner information that
10 we're supposed to rely on to try and make this
11 decision, in my view, what I'm hearing, is quite
12 possibly more accurate in regards to non-subsistence
13 hunters than it is for subsistence hunters.

14 One of our other considerations I think
15 in this whole discussion is can we provide a
16 subsistence priority and how will that affect the non-
17 subsistence users, which according to ANILCA we are
18 supposed to consider as well. Kind of our discussions
19 about the data I think what we are seeing is that we
20 have probably less reliable data for subsistence users
21 than what we have for non-subsistence users.

22 I think just the way the whole hunter
23 survey is structured I think it does work better for
24 the non-subsistence hunters to report accurately. I
25 know we did the household surveys, which I agree are
26 very good way to judge subsistence uses, but they're 20
27 years old now. Just a lot has changed I think with the
28 way people are utilizing the resources on Prince of
29 Wales now.

30 I'm looking at the table on Page 93 and
31 for this subsistence priority and the question of
32 competition and how hard is it for subsistence users to
33 get their deer now. That table on Page 93 deals with
34 the deer per hunter, which essentially is that success
35 rate and how that is.

36 One of the things I see on that table
37 is that the non-subsistence hunters kind of have a
38 success rate which has stayed fairly consistent over
39 the past 10 years of around two deer per hunter. Our
40 proposal to lower the bag limit to two deer I don't
41 really feel that that is necessarily going to adversely
42 effect the non-subsistence hunters all that much in
43 Unit 2.

44

Page 114

1 As you pointed out, Mr. Bangs -- or Mr.
2 Porter pointed out in answer to your question there is
3 a decent huntable population of deer closer to
4 Ketchikan in District 1A and I do believe their bag
5 limit is four deer and probably will remain at four.
6 So I think by voting in favor of this proposal I think
7 it does have the potential to kind of help provide for
8 that subsistence priority without necessarily being a
9 major impact on the non-subsistence users.

10 I know the perception is always if you
11 cut my bag limit, you're taking away opportunity, but
12 in this case it might be more of a perception than a
13 reality just because of the way the pattern of use for
14 the non-subsistence hunters is usually to come over to
15 Prince of Wales Island for a trip and what they get on
16 that trip is kind of their effort for the year. Two
17 deer, chances are it's not going to make a huge
18 difference in their overall take of deer.

19 So I'm going to be in favor of this
20 proposal.

21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Don.

22 Ms. Needham and then Mr. Yeager.

23 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 Thank you, Mr. Hernandez for coming up with a great
25 justification to all of our points that I have a lot of
26 agreement with you. I was trying to think about how to
27 address each subject and you hit on a lot of really key
28 things that even I wasn't considering.

29 You know, one of the first things that
30 we have to think about is whether or not there's a
31 conservation concern. I just don't -- it's difficult
32 with this data, with the dataset and the information
33 that we have to know. I mean we've heard testimony not
34 just in the Craig meeting, but meetings prior from
35 users on the ground that they feel deer populations are
36 declining.

37 I'd like to direct the Council's
38 attention to Page 153 in our Council book. It's the
39 analysis for the Wildlife Proposal WP18-04, which is
40 the wolf proposal in Unit 2. In the fourth paragraph
41 down it says there are various potential reasons for
42 the lower wolf estimate -- and I'm going to paraphrase
43

Page 115

1 a little bit here -- in 2014, including an increased
2 take of wolves from the study area prior to the 2014
3 deer populations and then it says decreases in deer
4 abundance, which is in direct reference to Unit 2.
5 Other reasons are availability of non-ungulate prey,
6 increases in disease in wolves, increases in unreported
7 wolf
8 take and then the possibility of a decrease in the
9 vulnerability of deer to wolf predation.

10 When I read that, I feel like I'm
11 getting a little bit of a conflicting message just from
12 the agencies and the information that they're giving us
13 and how we're using the information that's available
14 out there.

15 So with that being said, I feel like
16 there is a conservation concern, which may not be
17 overwhelmingly supported by biological substantial
18 evidence, however we've heard a lot of traditional
19 ecological knowledge from users on the island and
20 tribal organizations who have taken the time to weigh
21 in on this important matter.

22 Again, I'd like to reiterate Mr.
23 Hernandez's points to the other items on our
24 justification list of whether or not it would be
25 beneficial or detrimental to subsistence users needs
26 and he stated that it would provide more of a
27 subsistence priority and wouldn't unnecessarily
28 restrict other users given the data that he pointed to
29 in terms of two deer as the average of non-Federally
30 qualified user take on Unit 2.

31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Cathy.

32 Mr. Yeager and then Mr. Schroeder and
33 Mr. Douville.

34 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
35 Quite frankly I'm having a difficult time figuring out
36 which way I support or don't support this for the
37 following reasons. One was clearly stated by my fellow
38 Council Member Mr. Hernandez. It's the responsibility
39 of all of us to accurately report regardless of whether
40 we're subsistence users or non-qualified or
41 non-resident or whatever and I feel that is a huge part
42 of the data is proper reporting.

Page 116

1 So Staff had put together this analysis
2 and they presented it to us and that was taken into
3 consideration, but they only had a certain amount of
4 data that they could put this presentation together
5 with. By looking at that, I didn't see the detrimental
6 impacts to subsistence users.

7 I know that there are resolutions that
8 state this and I know that I personally have not been
9 approached or addressed about not having subsistence
10 needs met on Prince of Wales, but I leave that to my
11 other Council Members that live there. I feel that
12 there's already a subsistence prior by the number of
13 deer and the amount of time and special openings that
14 they have already, so I don't know if by going any
15 further on limiting a bag limit or reducing a bag limit
16 that that is seen as creating more of a subsistence
17 priority when there's already one there and
18 established.

19 The impact to subsistence users, I
20 don't know with the recording the way it is, I don't
21 know if that's an impact that could be measured at this
22 point. I have favorite moose spots on the Stikine
23 River and this year when I went there there was already
24 a skiff tied up. So does that mean that I'm being
25 impacted by that opportunity? Maybe, but I didn't
26 think so. I just went to another spot.

27 I can't put a number value on impacts
28 to subsistence users.
29 No disrespect to Mr. Howard, but to me that's not a
30 viable impact. That doesn't meet my definition. So
31 I'm having difficulty supporting this because I feel
32 that the needs are being met and I would just like the
33 Council to know that I don't know if I'll be voting in
34 favor for those reasons.

35 Thank you.

36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, John.

37 Mr. Schroeder.

38 MR. SCHROEDER: I have a procedural
39 motion to split the question. Motion to split the
40 question is not a debatable motion. The rationale for
41 splitting the motion is that our proposal has two
42 components to it. One component is to reduce the bag
43

Page 117

1 limit and the other component is to reduce the season
2 for non-Federally qualified users. I believe these
3 should be considered separately for quite a number of
4 reasons that I could get into after we vote to do this.

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
6 Schroeder.

7 Mr. Douville.

8 MR. SCHROEDER: According to Roberts
9 Rules of Order a motion to split, my motion is not
10 debatable and it needs to be acted on.

11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'm sorry. I didn't
12 realize you were making a motion. I thought you were
13 talking about....

14 MR. SCHROEDER: My motion is to split
15 the question so that we would then have two proposals.
16 The one proposal would be to reduce the harvest to two
17 deer and the second proposal would be concerning the
18 season length. That needs to be either voted up or
19 down.

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do we have a second.

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We have a
23 second with a motion on the floor to split the two
24 issues, one being that we're going to reduce the
25 timeframe of the hunt and the other being we're going
26 to reduce the bag limit. Discussion. I was just
27 informed of Robert's Rules. We already have a motion
28 on the floor. We adopted this proposal.

29 MR. SCHROEDER: The motion to split a
30 proposal comes under that. It's like an amendment....

31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Would you call it an
32 amendment?

33 MR. SCHROEDER:however it's not
34 debatable.

35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Would that be the
36 correct wording is call it an amendment?

Page 118

1 MR. SCHROEDER: No. It's splitting a
2 motion. I went through this one time in my previous
3 existence and probably Albert, who genetically knows
4 Robert's Rules of Order, will support me on this. Or
5 we can stand down and check Robert's Rules of Order.
6

7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah, let's take a
8 recess of five minutes and we'll check this out and
9 make sure we do it correctly.
10

11 (Off record)
12

13 (On record)
14

15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Please take your
16 seats. Well, we had a little more than a five-minute
17 break, I guess, but we figured it out how we're going
18 to proceed and the cleanest way we could do this. I
19 think what we're going to do is ask Mr. Kitka to
20 rescind his original motion and Mr. Yeager to retract
21 his second and then we're going to address an A and a B
22 proposal 18-01.
23

24 So, Mr. Kitka.
25

26 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I so
27 rescind.
28

29 MR. YEAGER: I rescind.
30

31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. It's been
32 rescinded, the motion and the second. Mr. Schroeder.
33

34 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair. I move to
35 split proposal WP18-01 into two parts. Part (a) would
36 deal with the reduction in bag limit to two deer on
37 Federally public lands in Unit 2 for non-Federally
38 qualified users and part (b), WP18-01(b), would
39 consider the season reduction.
40

41 I so move.
42

43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.
44

45 Do we have a second.
46

47 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.
48

49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been seconded by
50

Page 120

1 solid base behind the 4,000 take. It's not on solid
2 ground. I don't believe it is for a second.
3

4 The locals are having a harder time
5 getting their deer. I'm not saying they're not getting
6 enough to starve to death, but they're having a harder
7 time for sure. So how much effort do they have to
8 expend before we address it.
9

10 Steve mentioned that the nonrural
11 hunters aren't very good at it. Well, I've got news
12 for you. These boys from Ketchikan have been coming
13 over there for quite a few years and they're pretty
14 darn good hunters. They've got a lot of experience,
15 they've learned the ground and their success rate is
16 real good. You can see it in the pickups that are going
17 out with a stack of deer on them. They're pretty good.
18

19 That's about all I have.
20

21 I think we're straining the deer
22 population in Unit 2 right now.
23

24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
25 Douville.
26

27 Mr. Hernandez.
28

29 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Bangs.
30 I'd kind of like to address the conservation concern as
31 well a little bit. I think Mike is right. We may not
32 be dealing with a conservation crisis yet, but I think
33 one could be looming. If we continue without making
34 some changes, I think we're going to get there a little
35 faster. We may get there anyway given a lot of
36 different factors.
37

38 I'm a little worried about just the
39 health of the population and sometimes you don't
40 necessarily -- things happen slowly over time and you
41 don't always necessarily see it happening until all of
42 a sudden you're in a bad situation.
43

44 Another factor in this hunter success,
45 something we see throughout harvesting in all fish and
46 wildlife is the difference that technology has made
47 over time. You talk about hunter success and how
48 people are going about getting their deer. I've seen a
49 lot more four-wheelers accessing closed roads. You see
50

Page 119

1 Mr. Douville. Discussion on 18-01(a), the reduction in
2 bag limit.
3

4 Cathy.
5

6 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 I'd like my comments that I made previously to follow
8 this first proposal, the reduction of bag limit.
9

10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.
11

12 Mr. Douville.
13

14 MR. DOUVILLE: I'm going to support the
15 motion. I'm seeing several things. The buck harvest
16 is getting smaller, meaning that there's less of them
17 growing up to maturity. Whenever you see a resource
18 getting smaller, generally it's under strain and I
19 believe that it is. We're seeing more less mature
20 bucks being harvested.
21

22 On that island we can't have a 4,000
23 buck take and still have an equal population. It
24 doesn't work that way. I think our buck/doe ratio is
25 way off. From the complaints that people tell me
26 that's exactly true. Even guys that are really good
27 hunters are not seeing the deer that they saw a few
28 years ago. They're getting some, but it's not easy for
29 them.
30

31 We have an increasing wolf population
32 that's growing up rapidly and they eat deer too. They
33 probably eat 4,000 a year. I don't know, it's probably
34 25 a year per wolf and we don't even know how many
35 there is, but you take 200 wolves and multiply that
36 times 25, that's a pretty big number too. Everybody is
37 seeing wolves. Everybody is complaining about wolves.
38 A few years ago you didn't hear that complaint, but
39 it's there now.
40

41 We have an increase in bear population.
42 It's been real restrictive for a few years now. We're
43 seeing lots more bears. One of these proposals
44 indicates that. They are predators also and affect the
45 deer population.
46

47 We have an increase in nonrural hunters
48 that are artificially keeping that 4,000 number up. I
49 think that eventually we're going to see there's not a
50

Page 121

1 a lot more big skiffs with drop bows packing around
2 four-wheelers going to remote places that weren't
3 accessible in the past.
4

5 The biggest change that I've seen in
6 the last five years is GPS technology. People are
7 learning places to hunt in a day that took years in the
8 past to figure out where you want to be and how to get
9 there. All these little factors. Development, closing
10 off of stem exclusion and how that's affecting the
11 patterns that people hunt. It's just kind of all
12 happening.
13

14 I think a big factor in hunter
15 management, we all talk about biology, but I think it's
16 almost just as important to consider psychology when
17 we're talking about some of these things. Just giving
18 the people the perception that everything is fine and
19 good and okay and we can have four and five deer bag
20 limits forever may not be a wise thing.
21

22 Maybe people ought to start realizing
23 that this is a precious resource and maybe there might
24 not be enough to go around for everybody forever. More
25 and more people want to take more and more from more
26 and more places. There's just a whole lot of factors
27 at play here.
28

29 Like I say, psychology of just
30 awareness that things are changing. Maybe we need to
31 be a little more conservative. Unfortunately in this
32 regime subsistence priority is our concern and I think
33 this is one step we can take to try and ensure that
34 into the future.
35

36 Thank you.
37

38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
39 Hernandez.
40

41 Mr. Schroeder, did you have a comment.
42

43 MR. SCHROEDER: I have a comment and I
44 wanted to jump in at this time because Staff may need
45 to do a little work on this. I looked at Table 4 on
46 Page 93 and I was trying to see what the effect on the
47 non-Federally qualified user overall take would be if
48 you went to two deer limit as well as a three deer
49 limit or four deer limit. I need a little help on this
50

Page 122

1 from Staff to see if the logic is correct.

2
3 It would appear that the 8 percent of
4 Federally qualified users who get four deer, if we say
5 100 hunters, that 8 percent would be getting 32 deer,
6 right, if we had 100 hunters? My rough calculation is
7 that the fourth deer for non-Federally qualified
8 hunters accounts for 22 percent of the overall
9 non-Federally qualified hunt take. The third deer
10 accounts for 23 percent of the overall non-Federally
11 qualified take.

12
13 So I think we should keep in mind when
14 we -- if the Council goes in the direction of
15 supporting a reduction in bag limit of what level of
16 reduction we would like overall. To say that again, if
17 we went to a two deer bag limit, by my back of the
18 envelope calculation, that would reduce non-Federally
19 qualified take on Prince of Wales by 45 percent.

20
21 I'm obviously suggesting that that
22 might be a little bit steep. So that's a technical
23 question and hopefully Jeff Reeves or Terry can see if
24 that logic is correct, which is the portion of deer
25 taken of the non-Federally qualified hunters who get
26 the third deer or fourth deer.

27
28 I'm intending to support this proposal.

29
30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
31 Schroeder. Any other comments.

32
33 Ms. Phillips.

34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
36 Bangs. Does Council Member Schroeder expect a response
37 before L....

38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think they're back
40 there calculating as we speak.

41
42 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
43 Bangs. So I'm honed in on Page 93, that second half of
44 the first sentence. There is continued concerns from
45 members of subsistence community regarding their
46 inability to meet their subsistence needs. To me this
47 is the primary concern. So Federally qualified harvest
48 is stable with a slight increase but demand is greater
49 than actual harvest.
50

Page 123

1 So the harvest objective on Page 90
2 from Fish and Game shows a harvest objective of 2,700
3 deer for Unit 2. Only in year 2005 and 2007 were we
4 below the harvest objective and every other year from
5 2006, '08, '09, '10, '11, '12, '13, '14, '15, '16 we've
6 exceeded the harvest objective. So there may not be a
7 conservation concern now, but if we continue to exceed
8 the harvest objective, there possibly could be a
9 conservation concern.

10
11 On Figure 4 it shows that a deer per
12 hunter for the non-Federally qualified is two deer, so
13 it would not unnecessarily restrict the non-Federally
14 qualified hunter who on average gets two deer anyway.
15 I don't see where it would be detrimental to them
16 because they're getting what they already on average
17 take.

18
19 The proposal would be beneficial to
20 Federally qualified subsistence harvesters because then
21 the opportunity to get what they actually need which is
22 not indicated in any of the recordkeeping here. In my
23 community, there are some families that take a lot of
24 deer and they need a lot of deer because they have a
25 lot of people to feed. That's a subsistence resource
26 and that's why that resource is there.

27
28 Our mandate under Title VIII is to
29 provide the opportunity for subsistence uses because of
30 increasing populations in Alaska and because of
31 accessibility to remote areas. We heard that from
32 Councilman Hernandez telling us that he's seen hunters
33 in areas he's never seen hunters before. The number of
34 hunters for non-Federally qualified is up from 148 in
35 2006 to 333 in 2015. That's up 185 hunters for non-
36 Federally qualified. So there is increasing pressure.

37
38 So given all that I am going to support
39 the proposal.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
44 Phillips. Do we have a calculation for Mr. Schroeder's
45 question or do you need more time?

46
47 MR. SUMINSKI: One more minute.

48
49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Mr.
50

Page 124

1 Howard.

2
3 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 When you look at the numbers of non-resident hunters
5 going into the island, the data appears to support
6 there should be a concern. Now if this was (in
7 Thingit), not in my house, what it means is we're
8 responsible, I'm responsible for my house. I don't tell
9 Mr. Kitka what to do in his home. So my point being is
10 if this was my house, I'd be concerned. I'd be
11 concerned that there would be no deer.

12
13 The way we look at things is I don't
14 sit here for me. I sit here for my grandchildren.
15 That this resource is bear when my grandchildren are
16 old enough to utilize it. If this doesn't cause this
17 board any concern, you have to look at the numbers
18 again. Their own numbers cause me concern and this
19 isn't even my back yard. But this same thing is
20 applied across the state of Alaska.

21
22 They tell us in Angoon we have no data
23 supporting anything when they have the data supporting
24 it. Their own data supports this proposal. I like to
25 be proactive, which means we should address this
26 problem before there is a problem.

27
28 Member Phillips mentioned that they get
29 two deer a year, which means it's not going to affect
30 them anyway. We have recognized tribes asking for
31 this. We're here for subsistence users, not non-
32 subsistence users. We're given clear direction on our
33 purpose sitting here.

34
35 I'm very concerned with -- looking at
36 the numbers you have wolves on the increase. That has
37 an impact on the deer. You have more and more people
38 coming from Ketchikan. That has an impact on the deer.
39 So there might be 400 last year. Who's to say there's
40 600 this year because a friend of mine said this is
41 where we should go from Ketchikan to go hunting. This
42 happens in Angoon.

43
44 Mr. Yeager talked about my impact. Let
45 me explain something to you. We hunt a place Catherine
46 Island well known for deer. Numbers are there. Fish
47 and Game must have the numbers. Somebody is able to
48 look at it online and they got their \$300,000 boat.
49 According to Fish and Game data, we should be hunting
50

Page 125

1 in Catherine Island.

2
3 This is the impact of your data and you
4 wonder why your data is not consistent. We should no
5 longer put this data online. You should keep it in
6 your office. Local knowledge knows where the deer is.
7 We don't need to get online and look. Well, Fish and
8 Game says I should be hunting in Craig this year.

9
10 That data should be held close. A lot
11 of what we know is held close in Angoon. It's the
12 toughest thing because my son, maybe has his
13 grandfather's heart, he's willing to share his
14 information, but we're learning to hold things close as
15 far as what we know. A lot of these things we should
16 consider now.

17
18 They wonder why nobody fills out those
19 cards anymore. If you can promise me you're not going
20 to put it on the internet, I guarantee you're going to
21 have more effective data. But once you do and I see
22 another boat in our area that's having an impact on my
23 ability to subsist and take care of elders in our
24 community, you're never going to get useful data. We
25 have it within our own tribe.

26
27 I'm now the president of the tribe and
28 the elders on that council are teaching me, for no
29 other way to say it, the hard way. Sometimes it's shut
30 up and sit down, Albert.

31
32 (Laughter)

33
34 MR. HOWARD: And other times it's you
35 don't know what you're talking about. You should learn
36 before you open your mouth. Mr. Chairman, I think we
37 should be very concerned with the residents on the
38 island.

39
40 I think that's our charge and the
41 reason we're here.

42
43 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
46 Howard. Anyone else.

47
48 (No comments)

Page 126

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'd like to say that I
2 feel compelled by public testimony we've heard in the
3 last couple meetings that there's definitely a concern.
4 The data shows that there could be potential problems
5 down the road. With the activity of habitat changes
6 that are coming down the road, I think there is going
7 to be a definite possibility of problems.

8 I think that even if the percentages
9 look a little overwhelming with going from four to two,
10 the Federal Board always has the opportunity to amend
11 it to three if they feel that's more fair, so I don't
12 think that's an issue in my mind. I'm going to be in
13 support of this proposal.

14 Anyone else.

15 Mr. Schroeder.

16 MR. SCHROEDER: I'll just speak in
17 support of this proposal based on what Chairman Bangs
18 was saying about our public testimony and from our
19 tribal partners supporting the proposal as written. I
20 really can't come up with some reason why people would
21 be complaining that they're having trouble getting deer
22 and tribal councils would be coming up with resolutions
23 if there wasn't a real problem.

24 I'm also very disturbed at the
25 inconclusiveness of the quantitative data, which I
26 think might only show that there's a problem with deer
27 if there aren't any deer. It just isn't designed and
28 we don't have the accuracy to come up with something
29 that says, oh, well, people's needs aren't being met at
30 the -- only 50 percent of their needs are being met.

31 So I believe our job is to provide a
32 subsistence opportunity and that this proposal helps us
33 do that. I also think that my earlier calculations
34 were wrong, so I'm waiting for staff to come up with
35 better numbers for me.

36 Thank you.

37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
38 Schroeder. I think we've covered all the points of
39 justification, but I would like someone to read into
40 the record a brief summary of the justification.

Page 128

1 (Laughter)

2 MR. SCHROEDER: I would also refer to
3 -- we had an excellent report on wolf management and
4 habitat restoration and hopefully rehabilitation on
5 Prince of Wales, which really pointed to so much work,
6 very expensive work that needs to be done on Prince of
7 Wales to even maintain current productivity for deer
8 and the predator species of wolf.

9 So I believe that that is in our
10 record, so we're not talking about something that, oh,
11 just could happen or is this a strange weather event or
12 did someone shoot too many deer. We're talking about a
13 very serious manmade ecological problem, which is
14 coming at us real strong on Prince of Wales as second
15 growth becomes a less valuable habitat for deer and
16 obviously fewer deer and fewer wolves as well.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
19 Schroeder.

20 Mr. Hernandez.

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
22 Chairman. Can I just quote from the wolf habitat
23 management study dealing with the deer just to kind of
24 back up the point that Mr. Schroeder just said. It's
25 on Page 39 during the introduction to the wolf habitat
26 management report.

27 "The finding considered a population
28 model for Game Management Unit 2 that predicted
29 additional wolf population declines of 5 to 20 percent
30 over the next 30 years, primarily driven by predicted
31 declines in deer habitat capability, and therefore deer
32 abundance, due to forest management."

33 So we are looking at a problem coming
34 down the road. Like I said, I think we should start
35 sending the message that things are going to have to
36 change here in the future.

37 Thank you.

38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Donald. I
39 think that's what -- when we did the Unit 2 deer study

Page 127

1 Mr. Hernandez.

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: A brief summary, right.
3 Well, I think this is a case where the Council is
4 concerned about the rural residents being able to meet
5 their needs. It's also a proposal that will favorably
6 ensure that the rural residents have a priority use
7 over the deer.

8 We do have some concerns of a
9 conservation shortage that could possibly be imminent
10 if we don't take some action now. Better to take
11 action preemptively than wait until there is a problem.
12 And I think we've kind of established that voting in
13 favor of this proposal would provide for rural
14 subsistence preference without unduly negatively
15 impacting the non-subsistence users.

16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very much,
17 Donald. I knew you would speak eloquently to the
18 justification. Are there any other comments. Do we
19 have a calculation if that matters? I think we know
20 what we're going to do, but -- you don't have a
21 calculation? Okay. Well, I guess we won't worry about
22 that.

23 Mr. Kitka.

24 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
25 just had one thing I wanted to share. Basically for a
26 long time I've said subsistence users have always been
27 an early warning sign. Our TEK will tell you that. If
28 things are starting to have problems somewhere along
29 the line, our traditional people will tell you
30 something is happening, we better do something.

31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

32 Mr. Schroeder.

33 MR. SCHROEDER: Just to put some other
34 numbers into the record since my earlier calculation
35 was wrong, I think my current calculation is that if
36 you lop off the fourth deer, you reduce the
37 non-Federally qualified take by 6 percent and if you
38 lop off the third year I believe it's 13 percent. So
39 my earlier calculation was incorrect and this one may
40 also be incorrect.

Page 129

1 several years ago, that was the conclusion that science
2 gave us. It's not a matter of if, it's a matter of
3 when that the habitat will cause a decrease in deer.
4 Hopefully the rehabilitation process will happen sooner
5 than later, but I agree with what you're saying,
6 Donald.

7 Anyone else.

8 (No comments)

9 MR. KITKA: Call for the question.

10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question has been
11 called for.

12 Could you restate the motion for
13 clarification, Mr. Kitka.

14 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair. We were
15 splitting them. It's WP18-01(a), I believe. That's
16 reducing the bag limit from four deer to two for non-
17 qualified users.

18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. The
19 question has been called for and the motion has been
20 restated. All those in favor say aye.

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed.

23 MR. YEAGER: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: We have one opposed
25 and the rest are in favor.

26 Thank you.

27 We will move on to the next proposal.

28 MS. PHILLIPS: Part (b).

29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Part (b), the next
30 part of the proposal. And that reads -- that is the
31 reduction in time sequence. Mr. Schroeder, would you
32 like to read that into the record as far as what your
33 (b) motion is.

Page 130

1 MR. SCHROEDER: The (b) part of WP18-
2 01(b) calls for reducing the season for non-Federally
3 qualified subsistence users by one week or more on
4 Federal public lands in Unit 2.
5
6 I move to adopt.
7
8 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Second.
9
10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved and
11 seconded. Moved by Member Schroeder and seconded by
12 Mr. Reifentstahl.
13
14 Discussion.
15
16 Mr. Douville.
17
18 MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Chairman. I
19 will not support this one. I believe if the prior one
20 passes they'll have two tags and it doesn't really
21 matter what part of the season they hunt in. I don't
22 think any further restriction would have any value as
23 far as time.
24
25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
26 Douville. Any other comments.
27
28 (No comments)
29
30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I would like to say
31 that I agree with Mr. Douville. I think the reduction
32 of the bag limit is sufficient to help the concerns of
33 the subsistence users and a time restriction would not
34 be necessary.
35
36 Anyone else.
37
38 Mr. Schroeder.
39
40 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Bangs. I'm not
41 sure whether we want to do this, but we heard earlier
42 in Jeffrey's presentation that the Federal Subsistence
43 Board really doesn't have a precedent of lowering bag
44 limits. I don't know if we want to have a -- even
45 though that could be our preferred course, the Federal
46 Subsistence Board may not agree to lower bag limits.
47 So I'm not advocating one way or another on that. I
48 think we should think about that for a moment.
49
50

Page 132

1 MR. HOWARD: Yes.
2
3 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
4
5 MR. HERNANDEZ: No.
6
7 MR. KITKA: Raymond Sensmeier.
8
9 MR. SENSMEIER: Yes.
10
11 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.
12
13 MR. YEAGER: No.
14
15 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: No.
18
19 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
20
21 MS. NEEDHAM: No.
22
23 MR. KITKA: It passed?
24
25 MS. NEEDHAM: Six to five.
26
27 MR. KITKA: Six to five?
28
29 MS. NEEDHAM: Wait. Yeah.
30
31 MR. KITKA: Six to five. Six yea, five
32 no (sic).
33
34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: So the motion carries
35 6-5, is that right?
36
37 MS. PERRY: That's what I have.
38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Six in favor, five no.
40 So reducing the time for non-Federally qualified
41 hunters is decreased. Everybody understand? Could we
42 get a recap on that, Mr. Kitka.
43
44 (Discussion about votes)
45
46 MR. KITKA: Actually, could I correct
47 my vote?
48
49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Harvey. Could
50

Page 131

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other thoughts or
2 comments.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think with the
7 proposal, whether we vote it up or down, I think the
8 Federal Board could take that into consideration. If
9 they decided not to take one or the other, they have
10 that option. I believe there's substantial evidence
11 that we do reduce the bag limit and I don't think
12 there's enough evidence to say we need to decrease the
13 time. That's just my opinion.
14
15 Anyone else have any comments.
16
17 (No comments)
18
19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Entertain a call for
20 the question.
21
22 MR. YEAGER: Question.
23
24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question has been
25 called for by Mr. Yeager.
26
27 I think we'll take a roll call on this
28 one, Mr. Kitka.
29
30 MR. KITKA: Steve Reifentstahl.
31
32 MR. REIFENSTUHL: No.
33
34 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
35
36 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
37
38 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.
39
40 MR. DOUVILLE: No.
41
42 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.
43
44 Robert Schroeder.
45
46 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.
47
48 MR. KITKA: Albert Howard.
49
50

Page 133

1 you just go over the vote again and then we'll clarify
2 precisely what we messed up on.
3
4 MR. KITKA: Okay. Steve Reifentstahl.
5
6 MR. REIFENSTUHL: No.
7
8 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
9
10 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
11
12 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.
13
14 MR. DOUVILLE: No.
15
16 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka. I vote no on
17 this. I didn't think about this before.
18
19 Robert Schroeder.
20
21 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.
22
23 MR. KITKA: Albert Howard.
24
25 MR. HOWARD: Yes.
26
27 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
28
29 MR. HERNANDEZ: No.
30
31 MR. KITKA: Raymond Sensmeier.
32
33 MR. SENSMEIER: Yes.
34
35 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.
36
37 MR. YEAGER: No.
38
39 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
40
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: No.
42
43 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
44
45 MS. NEEDHAM: No.
46
47 MR. KITKA: I got seven no's.
48
49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: So it's four in favor
50

Page 134

1 votes and seven negative votes, so the motion for
2 decreasing the time fails.

3
4 Everybody is clear on that?

5
6 (Council nodding)

7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Now we can move
9 on to the next proposal. This proposal has to do with
10 modifying customary and traditional use determinations
11 for deer in Units 1-5.

12
13 Ms. Pippa Kenner for OSM.

14
15 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
16 analysis for Proposal WP18-02 begins on Page 105 of
17 your Council books. There are some extra Council books
18 on the back table for people in the audience who would
19 like to follow along. Additionally, you might be
20 interested in looking at maps for this. There are maps
21 of the Southeast Region beginning on Page 394 of the
22 Council book. There's also handouts around the room.

23
24 So to start with I'd like to thank
25 everyone for having this meeting on their territory and
26 I'd like to thank all the Council Members for inviting
27 me down today. It's a real honor to be in front of
28 this Council. For the record, my name is Pippa Kenner
29 and I'm an anthropologist with the Office of
30 Subsistence Management.

31
32 This proposal was submitted by the
33 Southeast Council, you, and requests to modify the
34 customary and traditional use determination for deer in
35 Units 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 so that all
36 rural residents of Southeast Alaska are eligible to
37 hunt deer under Federal regulations.

38
39 The Council stated that customary and
40 traditional use determinations for deer in Units 1-5
41 need to be reviewed because they are restricting
42 subsistence uses. People in Southeast Alaska travel
43 from home to other communities for many reasons, such
44 as to visit family and friends, to harvest wild
45 resources
46 for potlatches and other cultural celebrations, to
47 return to traditional clan and kwaan or tribe
48 territories, and for other reasons.

Page 135

1 At these times, they need to be able to
2 continue long-standing patterns of hunting. Currently,
3 they are not able to because of a patchwork of
4 customary and traditional use
5 determinations, which is a legacy of State subsistence
6 management from the 1980s. The Council stated this
7 history has created an unnecessary and confusing
8 regulatory complexity making it difficult for
9 subsistence users to know where they can hunt deer
10 under Federal regulations.

11
12 The proponent, the Council, asked for
13 these changes to improve regulatory clarity,
14 subsistence opportunity, and deer management
15 efficiency.

16
17 The customary and traditional uses of
18 deer by residents of all the rural communities in
19 Southeast Alaska have been recognized by the Board.
20 They all have a customary and traditional use
21 determination. Because of that the focus of my
22 analysis is expanding those existing customary and
23 traditional use determinations for residents of each
24 community and residents of each management unit to all
25 of Southeast Alaska Units 1-5.

26
27 On Page 107 you're going to see Table
28 1. Federal public lands comprise a large portion of
29 lands in Southeast Alaska and the breakdown by unit and
30 sub-unit can be seen in Table 1.

31
32 At the beginning of the Federal
33 Subsistence Management Program in Alaska in 1992, the
34 Board adopted the
35 State's customary and traditional use determinations
36 for Units 1-5 into permanent regulations. On Page 107
37 is a description of Council-supported modifications
38 that occurred in 1996 and 1998.

39
40 On Page 108 is a discussion on the
41 background that starts talking about that deer are
42 indigenous to most of Southeast Alaska.

43
44 According to the census, this proposal
45 would affect roughly 26,000 rural residents of
46 Southeast Alaska living in about 32 small or medium
47 size rural communities and they are listed in Table 2
48 on Page 111.

Page 136

1 On Page 110 begins the meat of the
2 conversation and it is discussing the eight factors for
3 determining customary and traditional use.

4
5 To sum up, community deer harvest areas
6 may extend beyond traditional kwaan and contemporary
7 community use areas for various reasons in Southeast
8 Alaska such as availability of faster, larger boats,
9 the extensive ferry system or in response to lack of
10 deer or local closures by Fish and Game management and
11 this has been well documented. You can see that in the
12 analysis.

13
14 Additionally, Historical and
15 ethnographic sources indicate harvest and use of deer
16 by Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian residents of Southeast
17 Alaska. Deer was one of many sources of rendered oil
18 used in the diet. Deer was reportedly highly prized,
19 very abundant and relatively easy to harvest, and
20 comprised a
21 large part of the traditional food supply. Where deer
22 was not available, venison was obtained through trade
23 networks.

24
25 To that point, deer have generally been
26 absent from Unit 1D although historically deer were
27 occasionally taken when encountered in documented
28 ethnographic accounts.

29
30 Also for the Yakutat area, since the
31 introduction of deer to the Yakutat area, the modest
32 deer harvests recorded in Yakutat are more attributable
33 to regulatory restrictions and low deer
34 populations than to a lack of desire for deer.

35
36 So now I'm going to move to the effects
37 of the proposal. If the proposal was adopted, all rural
38 residents of Southeast Alaska would be eligible to
39 harvest deer under Federal regulations in Units 1-5.
40 If the proposal was not adopted, there would continue
41 to be no Federal priority for rural residents to hunt
42 deer in Unit 1D, and the Board would continue to be
43 unable to adopt Federal deer hunting seasons in Unit
44 1D. Rural residents of Southeast Alaska would be
45 restricted to hunting in only a portion of Southeast
46 Alaska under Federal regulations based on the current
47 patchwork of customary and traditional use
48 determinations.

Page 137

1 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
2 support Proposal 18-02.

3
4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5
6 That's the end of my presentation and I
7 welcome all questions.

8
9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Pippa. Any
10 questions.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I don't see any
15 questions. So what's the will of the Council. Excuse
16 me. Is there any reports from consultations from the
17 tribes or ANCSA corporations?

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: None. Agency comments
22 from ADF&G.

23
24 MS. SILL: Thank you. My name is
25 Lauren Sill. I'm the subsistence resource specialist
26 with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

27
28 On this proposal the Department is
29 neutral. Under current State regulations there is a
30 customary and traditional use finding for deer in all
31 units of Southeast Alaska except in 1D and in the non-
32 subsistence areas around Juneau and Ketchikan.

33
34 Deer hunting opportunities are provided
35 throughout the region under State regulations.
36 Adoption of this proposal would increase the pool of
37 Federally qualified users eligible to participate in
38 deer hunting opportunities provided under Federal
39 regulations, but the Department does not anticipate any
40 impacts on other users of deer in Units 1-5 without
41 further action by the Federal Subsistence Board or the
42 Alaska Board of Game.

43
44 The Department does not have any
45 conservation concerns for deer populations in Southeast
46 Alaska, however management strategy to increase the
47 number of deer in Unit 3 has been implemented by
48 establishing restrictive harvest regulations.

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Did you
2 have any comments, Mr. Scott?
3
4 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5 Just one comment just to point out to the Council that
6 the State currently doesn't have an open deer season in
7 GMU 1D. Primarily because of the extremely low density
8 of deer that occur there.
9
10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for
11 clarifying that. Any questions from the Council.
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. Thank
16 you. Are there any Federal agency comments.
17
18 (No comments)
19
20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Perry, are there
21 any tribal entities?
22
23 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Chair. There
24 are none.
25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other Regional
27 Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments or
28 Subsistence Resource Commissions.
29
30 MS. PERRY: No, Mr. Chair.
31
32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are there any public
33 comments that are written.
34
35 MS. PERRY: Yes, thank you. The public
36 comments start on Page 120 of the meeting book. The
37 summary of written public comments are as follows: Two
38 written comments were received. One was a general
39 public comment from Curtis Donald Thomas of Ketchikan
40 addressing all Southeast proposals. Key viewpoints
41 were that attempts were being made to fix a problem
42 that does not exist and he expressed concerns regarding
43 new classes of citizens with special hunting rights
44 being created, residency criteria and the ability of
45 some Alaskans to harvest 20 halibut a day.
46
47 An opposing comment was received from
48 Barnett Freedman of Thorne Bay, Prince of Wales Island.
49 Key viewpoints included a reduction of harvest as
50

1 needed as competition from outside hunters continues to
2 be an issue and a doe season does not make sense for
3 the health of the herd. He wrote no next to this
4 proposal number in his letter.
5
6 That concludes the public comments on
7 Wildlife Proposal 18-02.
8
9 Thank you.
10
11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms. Perry.
12 Are there any public testimonies in relation to this
13 proposal.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anyone online
18 that has testimony.
19
20 (No comments)
21
22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. I refer
23 to the Council for what their wishes are.
24
25 Mr. Yeager.
26
27 MR. YEAGER: Mr. Chair. I move to
28 adopt Wildlife Proposal WP18-02.
29
30 MS. NEEDHAM: Second.
31
32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved by Mr.
33 Yeager and seconded by Ms. Needham to accept the
34 proposal.
35
36 Discussion.
37
38 Mr. Kitka.
39
40 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
41 in favor of this proposal. I think that it's been long
42 overdue. I think that our memorial parties and things,
43 celebrations and things don't happen that often in our
44 communities. Sometimes when other relatives are
45 coming from other communities it gives them a chance to
46 help us gather the food for our parties. It's very
47 seldom that we take more than what was needed for that
48 party. It would be a very small number.
49
50

1 So I think it's long overdue.
2
3 Thank you.
4
5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.
6 Any other response, comments.
7
8 Mr. Schroeder.
9
10 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair. The
11 Southeast Regional Advisory Council has discussed C&T
12 processes quite a bit over the last probably five years
13 or so. I would like to make sure that our previous
14 discussions, which are in the transcripts of our other
15 meetings are included when Staff presents this proposal
16 to the Federal Subsistence Board.
17
18 I believe this proposal is completely
19 consistent with this Council's view of the way C&T
20 determinations should be made. Our view is that
21 customary and traditional use determinations should not
22 be used to restrict subsistence uses that other
23 provisions in ANILCA provide the vehicle for
24 discriminating among subsistence users should there be
25 the need to do so.
26
27 I'll be voting in favor of this
28 proposal and I commend the Council for its work over so
29 many years in addressing C&T issues.
30
31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
32 Schroeder. I think we talked about this at the last
33 meeting or the meeting before when Mr. Howard brought
34 up the point that he travels to visit family and it's
35 very important to him and his family that he's able to
36 hunt in other areas that he might not have customary
37 and traditional use findings in the past and that was
38 what I think brought it to the forefront of our
39 discussion about how our area is very unique to the
40 State of Alaska because of island living and our
41 families are spread out amongst the islands.
42
43 I'm going to be in support of this as
44 well. It's very fitting for our region to extend
45 customary and traditional use to all rural residents.
46
47 Thank you. Anyone else.
48
49 (No comments)
50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there someone that
2 could appropriate the justification to explain it on
3 the record.
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I guess I'll give it a
8 stab then. Well, there isn't a conservation concern,
9 but I think it's overwhelming support for customary and
10 traditional uses throughout the region for our
11 Federally qualified subsistence users. There's
12 evidence from -- well, the traditional ecological
13 knowledge of how we travel and how our families are
14 spread out through the region and we do visit each
15 other. It's important that we're able to share in
16 cultural exchanges and fish and wildlife take.
17
18 I think this recommendation will be
19 beneficial to subsistence users as this will enable
20 them to share with their families and friends. I don't
21 think it will unnecessarily restrict other users as we
22 heard in the analysis.
23
24 Therefore I'll be supporting this
25 proposal.
26
27 Thank you.
28
29 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Question.
30
31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Reifensstuhl has
32 called for the question.
33
34 Mr. Kitka, would you take the roll
35 call, please.
36
37 MR. KITKA: Steve Reifensstuhl.
38
39 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Yes.
40
41 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
42
43 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
44
45 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.
46
47 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
48
49 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.
50

1 Robert Schroeder.
 2
 3 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.
 4
 5 MR. KITKA: Albert Howard.
 6
 7 MR. HOWARD: Yes.
 8
 9 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
 10
 11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
 12
 13 MR. KITKA: Raymond Sensmeier.
 14
 15 MR. SENSMEIER: Yes.
 16
 17 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.
 18
 19 MR. YEAGER: Yes.
 20
 21 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
 22
 23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes.
 24
 25 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
 26
 27 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.
 28
 29 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair. It was
 30 unanimous votes yes.
 31
 32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.
 33 The next proposals here, the next three are involved
 34 with wolves. If it's okay with the Council, I think we
 35 have time for possibly another proposal, but I think
 36 that these wolf proposals should be dealt with in order
 37 and the continuity of the analysis and stuff. If it's
 38 okay with the Council, I'd like to skip down to the
 39 WP18-06, increase season and harvest limit for black
 40 bear.
 41
 42 MR. DOUVILLE: Wonderful.
 43
 44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
 45 Douville. I think this would be appropriate for the
 46 time we have left. Thank you.
 47
 48 Mr. Suminski.
 49
 50

1 MR. SUMINSKI: Good afternoon,
 2 Chairman. Council Members. I'm Terry Suminski with
 3 the Forest Service. Proposal WP18-06, requests the
 4 season for black bear in Unit 2 be lengthened from
 5 September 1 to June 30 to August 24th through June 30th
 6 and the harvest limits be increased from two to four
 7 bears. This was submitted by the Klawock Cooperative
 8 Association and Jeff Reeves will present the analysis.
 9
 10 Thank you.
 11
 12 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman.
 13
 14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there someone
 15 online?
 16
 17 MR. REEVES: Jeff Reeves.
 18
 19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, thank you. I'm
 20 glad you're still on there, Jeff.
 21
 22 Go ahead.
 23
 24 MR. REEVES: Okay. So Jeff Reeves,
 25 U.S. Forest Service. Terry just introduced. I'm
 26 presenting the analysis on WP18-06. The executive
 27 summary is on Page 197. The analysis begins on Page
 28 199 in your book.
 29
 30 This proposal was submitted by the
 31 Klawock Cooperative Association and requests the season
 32 for black bear in Unit 2 be lengthened from September 1
 33 to June 30th to August 24 to June 30th and the harvest
 34 limit be increased from two bears to four bears.
 35
 36 The proponent believes the changes are
 37 necessary as they are concerned that black bear are
 38 having a negative effect on deer in Unit 2,
 39 particularly when coupled with extreme weather events
 40 and increased harvest of both species by nonresident
 41 hunters. Further clarification with the proponent
 42 indicated the intent of the proposal is to use
 43 liberalized harvest as a means of reducing predation on
 44 deer.
 45
 46 Following an explanation to the
 47 proponent that the Federal Subsistence Board could not
 48 adopt regulations simply for predator control, the
 49 proponent indicated they still wanted to move the
 50

1 proposal forward to see if the Board would still
 2 support an increase to the season and harvest limits to
 3 benefit Federally qualified subsistence users.
 4
 5 The Board has not made a customary and
 6 traditional use determination for black bear in Unit 2.
 7 Therefore, all Federally qualified subsistence users
 8 may harvest this species in this unit.
 9
 10 The Board adopted existing State
 11 hunting regulations for black bear in Unit 2 in 1990.
 12 Since this time, there have been no proposals submitted
 13 through the Federal regulatory process regarding black
 14 bear in this unit.
 15
 16 Federal regulations require salvage of
 17 the hide and edible meat year round as well as the
 18 skull being available during the sealing process.
 19
 20 Although no black bear population
 21 studies have been completed in Unit 2, black bear
 22 populations in the unit are believed to be increasing.
 23
 24 After averaging 123 bears per year
 25 during 1980 1988 and 221 bears annually from 1989 to
 26 1995, harvest increased to an average of 353 bears from
 27 1994 2002. During 2003 2007 the average
 28 increased again to 431 bears annually, constituting a
 29 350% increase in harvest over two decades. Harvest
 30 peaked in 2005 at nearly 500 bears and has declined
 31 since. A summary of harvest can be found in Figure 1.
 32
 33 On average, Alaska residents living in
 34 Unit 2 accounted for 6 percent of the harvest, other
 35 Alaska residents another 9 percent, and the remaining
 36 85 percent of the harvest being taken by nonresidents.
 37
 38 This proposal only increases the
 39 harvest limit and season for Federally qualified users
 40 trying to harvest black bear on Federal lands.
 41 Increasing the harvest limits as proposed could allow
 42 for unsustainable harvests resulting in conservation
 43 issues similar to those that were documented in the
 44 recent past.
 45
 46 Adoption of the proposal would create a
 47 divergence between State and Federal regulations for
 48 black bear in the unit. With a large amount of State
 49 and private land in Unit 2, the proposal may create
 50

1 confusion for both non-Federally qualified and
 2 Federally qualified subsistence users. The proposal
 3 would have no direct effect on non-Federally qualified
 4 subsistence users hunting black bear on Federal lands.
 5
 6 The Staff recommendation is to oppose
 7 Proposal 18-06 as conservative black bear regulations
 8 were established for nonresidents beginning in 2010 in
 9 response to unsustainable harvests that were noted.
 10 Although the black bear population in Unit 2 has seemed
 11 to increase, it is not at a level to increase harvests
 12 beyond the current regulations.
 13
 14 Lastly, documented black bear harvest
 15 by Federally qualified subsistence users has been
 16 remarkably consistent which suggests subsistence needs
 17 are being met and that harvest limits and season do not
 18 need to be elevated to the proposed levels to further
 19 benefit Federally qualified users.
 20
 21 That concludes the proposal and I'll
 22 take any questions.
 23
 24 Thank you.
 25
 26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.
 27
 28 Any questions for Mr. Reeves.
 29
 30 (No comments)
 31
 32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none. Thank
 33 you for your time, Jeff. I'm glad you hung in there.
 34
 35 Do you have anything to add, Terry.
 36
 37 (No comments)
 38
 39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Is there
 40 any reports from consultations from the tribes or ANCSA
 41 corporations?
 42
 43 (No comments)
 44
 45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: None. Agency comments
 46 from ADF&G.
 47
 48 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman. Members of
 49 the Council. My name is Boyd Porter. I work for Alaska
 50

Page 146

1 Department of Fish and Game. We should have the
2 PowerPoint there. This is State comments on Proposal
3 WP18-06 to increase the black bear bag limit in Unit 2.

4 Just for historical perspective that's
5 a graph showing male and female bears over time and you
6 can that peak where the blue line makes a peak around
7 2005. We were harvesting almost 500 bears from Unit 2.
8 There was some concern that that was too high a harvest
9 and when you look at the literature on black bear
10 management you can actually damage a black bear
11 population by harvesting at that high level. So we
12 were looking for ways to reduce that harvest down.

13 I'd also point out on that graph that
14 the red bars are nonresidents -- I'm sorry, on the next
15 one I'm going to show you nonresidents. That red bar
16 on that one is males and the green is female bears.
17 Blue line is total bears. So those are by hunter
18 status. The red again is nonresidents in the bar. The
19 yellow line at the top is total harvest. The green at
20 the bottom bar is the Federally qualified harvest.
21 Hunters harvesting bears that are Federally qualified.
22 Then the blue bars there next to them are the non-
23 Federally qualified hunters taking black bears out of
24 Unit 2.

25 So this one just look at the colors in
26 the bars over time. These are three communities on
27 Prince of Wales. Yellow is Thorne Bay, the blue in the
28 middle of the bars is Klawock and the red is Craig
29 residents harvesting black bears. So you can see there
30 is some harvest every year and it varies over time.

31 In summary, ADF&G is mandated to manage
32 for a healthy black bear population and reasonable
33 hunter opportunity. ADF&G reduced the nonresident
34 harvest extremely when we went to drawing permits after
35 the 2010 Board of Game meeting. So now we have a split
36 between drawing permits for nonresidents in the fall
37 and in the spring. We issue a different number of
38 permits for fall and for spring.

39 So we can fluctuate those permit
40 numbers, the number of permits we offer over time and
41 ratchet it up as we feel like the black bear population
42 has recovered, so we have some flexibility in that. It
43 did not affect Federally or non-Federally qualified
44 Alaskans, so we didn't impact that harvest.

Page 147

1 The last point is Federally qualified
2 hunters currently rarely harvest the two bear bag
3 limit. As you can see in that last bullet, 6 hunters
4 in the last 10 years have taken that two bear bag
5 limit.

6 If you have any questions.

7 That concludes our presentation.

8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Porter.

9 Mr. Hernandez.

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
11 How do you gather this information. What are the
12 reporting requirements for black bear for both resident
13 and nonresident now? I want to get at the reliability
14 of these numbers, so give me an idea.

15 MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Member
16 Hernandez. It's mandatory that you bring a bear in to
17 have it sealed, so a representative from the Department
18 actually handles the bear, pulls a tooth and puts a
19 locking tag on the skull and on the hide. Gets some
20 biological information at the same time. So there's
21 actually a sealing certificate that's filled out for
22 each one. General location where it's harvested, date
23 of harvest, numbers of days hunting before you harvest.

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: Just a follow up. And
25 those requirements apply to both subsistence, non-
26 subsistence, resident, nonresident, everybody that
27 hunts a bear?

28 MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Yes,
29 everybody.

30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Thank you,
31 Don.

32 Is there -- oh, Mr. Schroeder.

33 MR. SCHROEDER: Just a quick question
34 since we were talking so much about the reporting for
35 deer harvest and we'll be getting into unreported wolf
36 harvest sometime or another later in this meeting. Do
37 you see that there's a bunch of kill that is not
38 reported or are you pretty confident in these numbers?

Page 148

1 MR. PORTER: Boy, illegal harvest,
2 there's some. We know there's some, but I feel like we
3 get a pretty good tally of the number of bears and the
4 sex ratio and all that stuff.

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. If there
6 is an increase in bear population -- you know, talking
7 to people from Unit 2 and discussions about the wolf
8 population and whatnot and we've heard there's
9 substantial increase in bears. What are your thoughts
10 on that and how soon would you consider -- what
11 threshold did you ratchet up the amount of draw
12 permits?

13 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman. That's all
14 built into that harvest strategy when we adopted those
15 drawing permit regulations and we will ratchet them up
16 as necessary. Probably more on the spring drawing
17 permits than on the fall because if -- just for
18 clarification when we were discussing the drawing
19 permits for nonresidents, there was a lot of input from
20 Federally qualified hunters on Prince of Wales that did
21 not appreciate all the hunters in the field in the fall
22 conflicting with all their subsistence gathering,
23 hunting and all subsistence hunting and fishing.

24 So we offer many less fall permits than
25 we do spring permits currently. If we ratchet those
26 numbers up, it will be on the spring side.

27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Porter.

28 Mr. Reifensstuhl.

29 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Thank you. What
30 explains the low number of harvest in 13? It was
31 dramatically lower than in other years.

32 MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. I was
33 trying to think what happened in 2013.

34 MR. REIFENSTUHL: It's on your bar
35 graph.

36 MR. PORTER: That was when we changed
37 to the drawing permits, so it was a 2010 Board of Game
38 meeting. By the time the regulation actually took
39 effect. The following year, before the regulation took
40 effect, we went to a controlled use area so we were

Page 149

1 regulating nonresident hunters using vehicles on the
2 road system to hunt bears. So there was a little
3 transition there, but that's when we reduced that
4 harvest down.

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions
6 from the Council.

7 Mr. Yeager.

8 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Do
9 you feel that with the potential increase from two to
10 four -- how substantial do you think the possibilities
11 of taking sows comes into play there.

12 MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Unless
13 that was a significant increase in the harvest, I
14 wouldn't think that's going to impact the population.

15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.

16 Mr. Douville.

17 MR. DOUVILLE: For the rural users on
18 Prince of Wales take 6 percent, so an increase of 12
19 percent is not a significant increase. It doesn't seem
20 like. The numbers are very low.

21 MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Maybe
22 that could be a potential other source of red meat if
23 people on Prince of Wales decide they want to harvest
24 more black bears.

25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.

26 Mr. Douville, follow up.

27 MR. DOUVILLE: I guess the reason I
28 asked that, if there was a significant -- if that was
29 to increase to 12 percent instead of 6, what does that
30 do to your numbers as far as regulation?

31 MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Mr.
32 Douville. We can fluctuate those nonresident permits,
33 so depending on what the subsistence users wanted to do
34 with increasing their harvest we could move around
35 that.

36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.

Page 150	Page 152
<p>1 (No comments)</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none. Thank</p> <p>4 you. Are there any Federal agency comments.</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 (No comments)</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any tribal entities.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 MS. PERRY: No tribal comments</p> <p>11 received.</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any other</p> <p>14 Regional Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committee or</p> <p>15 Subsistence Resource Commissions.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 MS. PERRY: No comments, Chair.</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are there any written</p> <p>20 public comments.</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 MS. PERRY: Yes. On Page 208 of the</p> <p>23 meeting book you'll find the public comments start for</p> <p>24 Wildlife Proposal 18-06. The summary of written public</p> <p>25 comments is as follows: One comment was received from</p> <p>26 Curtis Donald Thomas of Ketchikan addressing all</p> <p>27 Southeast proposals. Key viewpoints were that attempts</p> <p>28 were being made to fix a problem that does not exist</p> <p>29 and he expressed concerns regarding new classes of</p> <p>30 citizens with special hunting rights being created,</p> <p>31 residency criteria and the ability of some Alaskans to</p> <p>32 harvest 20 halibut a day.</p> <p>33</p> <p>34 That was the only written public</p> <p>35 comment addressing Wildlife Proposal 18-06.</p> <p>36</p> <p>37 Thank you.</p> <p>38</p> <p>39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms. Perry.</p> <p>40 Is there any other public testimony.</p> <p>41</p> <p>42 Please come forward.</p> <p>43</p> <p>44 DR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, Council</p> <p>45 Members. My name is Winston Smith. I'm currently a</p> <p>46 principal research scientist with the University of</p> <p>47 Alaska Fairbanks. I previously worked as a scientist</p> <p>48 with the Pacific Northwest Research Station, USDA</p> <p>49 Forest Service, Forestry Sciences Lab here in Juneau</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.</p> <p>2 Chairman. When you talk about predators having an</p> <p>3 effect on the populations, do you include human hunting</p> <p>4 as a predation or are you strictly talking about wolf</p> <p>5 and bear predation?</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 DR. SMITH: My experience has been</p> <p>8 primarily with non-human consumption of predators. I</p> <p>9 don't have any background or experience to be able to</p> <p>10 respond to the effect of humans on deer populations.</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 Mr. Douville.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 MR. DOUVILLE: Was your predation on</p> <p>17 deer referring to bear or wolf or both? You said the</p> <p>18 predators don't have an effect on deer populations,</p> <p>19 but were you referring to bear or wolf or did you</p> <p>20 include both?</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 DR. SMITH: My comments were primarily</p> <p>23 this afternoon about bear. I plan to offer comments</p> <p>24 tomorrow about wolves, but generally speaking my</p> <p>25 comments about predation on deer relate to all large</p> <p>26 predators and predation on deer.</p> <p>27</p> <p>28 MR. DOUVILLE: You lost me on that one.</p> <p>29</p> <p>30 DR. SMITH: Well, it could be wolves,</p> <p>31 it could be bear, it could be other predators that prey</p> <p>32 on deer as well.</p> <p>33</p> <p>34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Howard.</p> <p>35</p> <p>36 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.</p> <p>37 On the one hand you said there was no effect of black</p> <p>38 bear on deer and maybe two sentences later you hear</p> <p>39 that the black bear target fawns. That to me seems to</p> <p>40 contradict itself.</p> <p>41</p> <p>42 DR. SMITH: I don't think my comments</p> <p>43 were that bears don't have an effect on deer. I said</p> <p>44 that deer populations are not limited by black bear</p> <p>45 predation. Limiting a population and having a local</p> <p>46 influence through predation are different phenomena.</p> <p>47 That's making a different statement.</p> <p>48</p> <p>49 So, yes, black bears do take deer and</p> <p>50</p>
Page 151	Page 153
<p>1 and elsewhere the Pacific Northwest Research Station.</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 I've been a researcher and been</p> <p>4 involved in research and wildlife management for over</p> <p>5 40 years. Twenty-plus years of that have been here in</p> <p>6 Southeast Alaska. A lot of my research experience,</p> <p>7 most of which has been on Prince of Wales Island and</p> <p>8 Southern Southeast Alaska.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 I've done considerable research on both</p> <p>11 black bears and deer and I just wanted to offer the</p> <p>12 comment that deer populations are typically not limited</p> <p>13 by black bear or other predators. That primarily,</p> <p>14 although bears and other predators take deer, that</p> <p>15 primarily the factors that influence deer populations</p> <p>16 are related mostly to habitat. If suitable habitat is</p> <p>17 available, rarely -- and you will find unusual</p> <p>18 circumstances rarely will deer populations or other</p> <p>19 prey populations to be overly influenced or impacted by</p> <p>20 predators.</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 Now my understanding from information</p> <p>23 that I've seen, both communications with Alaska</p> <p>24 Department of Fish and Game and elsewhere with</p> <p>25 professionals, is that black bear do target deer fawns</p> <p>26 in the spring. So under those circumstances it's</p> <p>27 possible that black bear could influence local deer</p> <p>28 populations through their impacts on fawn mortality.</p> <p>29</p> <p>30 Generally speaking and for the most</p> <p>31 part I want to emphasize a point that predators and</p> <p>32 including black bear rarely -- that deer populations</p> <p>33 are rarely limited by predators. I wanted to offer</p> <p>34 these comments because as I understood the proposal one</p> <p>35 of the at least underlying or secondary goals or</p> <p>36 agendas would be by increasing black bear harvest that</p> <p>37 it would secondarily increase deer populations. I'd</p> <p>38 like to suggest that that expectation may not be</p> <p>39 realistic or may not occur as a result of that.</p> <p>40</p> <p>41 I wanted the Council to include this</p> <p>42 information when considering this particular proposal.</p> <p>43 With those comments I'll welcome any questions.</p> <p>44</p> <p>45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are there any</p> <p>46 questions for Mr. Smith.</p> <p>47</p> <p>48 Mr. Hernandez.</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1 it's been documented not only in Southeast Alaska but</p> <p>2 elsewhere, but in terms of population size of deer year</p> <p>3 in and year out the expectation that reducing black</p> <p>4 bear populations through harvest or through other means</p> <p>5 will actually result in deer populations increasing I</p> <p>6 question whether that would happen.</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 That's my point.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for</p> <p>11 clarification. Any other questions for Mr. Smith.</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 Mr. Hernandez.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Did you say</p> <p>16 you would be coming to testify when we talk about the</p> <p>17 wolf harvest?</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 DR. SMITH: Yes, tomorrow. Tomorrow</p> <p>20 morning.</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Smith.</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 DR. SMITH: Thank you.</p> <p>25</p> <p>26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there any other</p> <p>27 public testimony. Anyone on the teleconference.</p> <p>28</p> <p>29 (No comments)</p> <p>30</p> <p>31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. What's</p> <p>32 the will of the Council.</p> <p>33</p> <p>34 Mr. Hernandez.</p> <p>35</p> <p>36 MR. HERNANDEZ: I move to adopt</p> <p>37 Wildlife Proposal 18-06.</p> <p>38</p> <p>39 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Second.</p> <p>40</p> <p>41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved by</p> <p>42 Member Hernandez and seconded by Mr. Reifensstuhl to</p> <p>43 adopt the proposal.</p> <p>44</p> <p>45 Discussion.</p> <p>46</p> <p>47 Mr. Hernandez.</p> <p>48</p> <p>49 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.</p> <p>50</p>

Page 154

1 Chairman. I think I'm going to vote to oppose this
2 proposal. I haven't really heard that the proponents
3 are addressing a subsistence need here. To me that
4 should be our primary consideration. I mean they do
5 come right out and state that they're hoping to
6 increase deer populations by increasing the black bear
7 take. I mean that just doesn't address what we're
8 supposed to consider.

9 If that is their main goal, there are
10 hunters that are perfectly willing to take more black
11 bear to achieve that goal and the Alaska Department of
12 Fish and Game is ready and able to accomplish that and
13 I think that should be more their role than ours in
14 this.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
17 Hernandez. I would agree. I would not be in favor of
18 this. We're looking at the numbers. If only six
19 hunters have achieved taking of two black bear in the
20 past, the opportunity is already there and it doesn't
21 seem that they're taking what they could take already.

22 Anyone else.

23 Mr. Douville.

24 MR. DOUVILLE: I have mixed feelings.
25 I don't look at it as a predator control thing.
26 There's certainly not a conservation concern for black
27 bear. However, if I guess there was a subsistence user
28 on Prince of Wales that wanted four and could use them,
29 then I would have no opposition to that either.

30 However, most of us that live there do
31 not care to have a black bear hide or care to even eat
32 one. I guess that's my dilemma. I'm not trying to
33 restrict anybody that wants to eat four bears. There
34 probably are some people that do. There probably are
35 non-Natives that like to eat bears. They do and seem
36 to be okay with it, but most of the local population I
37 know do not harvest bears.

38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
39 Douville.

40 Mr. Reifensstuhl.

Page 156

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thanks for that
3 question, Patty. I was wondering the same thing.

4 Any other discussion.

5 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Call for question.

6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Steve. The
7 question has been called.

8 Can we take a roll call, please, Mr.
9 Kitka.

10 MR. KITKA: Steve Reifensstuhl.

11 MR. REIFENSTUHL: No.

12 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

13 MS. PHILLIPS: No.

14 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.

15 MR. DOUVILLE: No.

16 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka is no.

17 Robert Schroeder.

18 MR. SCHROEDER: No.

19 MR. KITKA: Albert Howard.

20 MR. HOWARD: No.

21 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: No.

23 MR. KITKA: Raymond Sensmeier.

24 MR. SENSMEIER: No.

25 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.

26 MR. YEAGER: No.

Page 155

1 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Thank you. I'm not
2 sure if you can take bears on proxy hunts, but if you
3 could that would be a way to take more bears if local
4 people wanted to. I mean I think the problem with the
5 proposal, which I won't support, is they didn't put it
6 in the same terms that our previous proposal did.

7 If they would have couched their
8 argument and it was a subsistence issue and you needed
9 to have predator control because there aren't enough
10 deer, which the former proposal was about ability to
11 harvest deer by Federally qualified users, then we
12 might be looking at this differently. Anyway, I won't
13 support this.

14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Steve.

15 Mr. Douville.

16 MR. DOUVILLE: I agree with Steve that
17 opportunity does exist for a designated hunter, I guess
18 if somebody wanted to use somebody else's tag and take
19 it home, they'd have that opportunity already. The
20 number is so small I would probably not support this
21 proposal.

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mike.

23 Patty.

24 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
25 Bangs. A question is that is the black bear eligible
26 for a designated hunter harvest?

27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think we'd have to
28 refer to Staff. Mr. Suminski.

29 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
30 Phillips. The designated hunter permit only addresses
31 moose, deer and goats, so bears are not included on a
32 designated hunter permit.

33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

34 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. So in order
35 to have a designated hunter permit for black bear you
36 would have to submit a new proposal.

37 MR. SUMINSKI: (Nods affirmatively)

Page 157

1 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.

2 CHAIRMAN BANGS: No.

3 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.

4 MS. NEEDHAM: No.

5 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion
6 failed 11 to nothing.

7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.
8 We could have done a yea or nay on that one, but I
9 wanted to make sure Harvey was still with us.

10 (Laughter)

11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. It's getting
12 pretty late here. I think we've covered a lot of
13 ground today and I'd like to recess until 8:30 in the
14 morning.

15 Thanks for all your guys's help keeping
16 us focused.

17 Thank you.

18 Have a good night.

19 (Off record)

20 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

<p>1 C E R T I F I C A T E</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)</p> <p>4)ss.</p> <p>5 STATE OF ALASKA)</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 . I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the</p> <p>8 state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court</p> <p>9 Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through</p> <p>12 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the</p> <p>13 SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL</p> <p>14 MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically on the 31st day</p> <p>15 of October in Juneau, Alaska;</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 THAT the transcript is a true and</p> <p>18 correct transcript requested to be transcribed and</p> <p>19 thereafter transcribed by under my direction and</p> <p>20 reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and</p> <p>21 ability;</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or</p> <p>24 party interested in any way in this action.</p> <p>25</p> <p>26 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 15th</p> <p>27 day of November 2017.</p> <p>28</p> <p>29</p> <p>30</p> <p>31 _____</p> <p>32 Salena A. Hile</p> <p>33 Notary Public, State of Alaska</p> <p>34 My Commission Expires: 09/16/18</p> <p>35</p> <p>36</p> <p>37</p> <p>38</p> <p>39</p> <p>40</p> <p>41</p> <p>42</p> <p>43</p> <p>44</p> <p>45</p> <p>46</p> <p>47</p> <p>48</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p>	